## In The Matter Of:

## BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING

\_\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEALS HEARING - Vol. 13 January 28, 2015

\_\_\_\_\_

## MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

101 Arch Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617.542.0039 Fax: 617.542.2119

Volume XXIII

Pages 1-118

Brookline Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

January 28, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc.

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

```
1
                            Appearances
 2.
      Board Members:
      Jesse Geller, Chairman
      Jonathan Book
 5
      Chris Hussey
 6
      Allison Steinfeld, Planning Director
 8
      Maria Morelli, Planning Consultant, Planning Department
      Samuel Nagler, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein
 9
10
      Edith M. Netter, Esquire,
11
      Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.
12
      Dan Bennett, Building Commissioner
13
      Joseph Geller, Stantec Consulting
      Marc Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty
14
      Steven Schwartz, Esquire, Goulston & Storrs
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	7:09 p.m.
3	MR. JESSE GELLER: Good evening, everyone. My
4	name is Jesse Geller. To my left is Jonathan Book, to
5	his left is Chris Hussey.
6	As people will recall, on January 12th we
7	closed the hearing. Tonight is our first meeting. The
8	board will continue a discussion of the decision.
9	The board members will recall on the 12th
10	staff provided certain comments to cherry-picked
11	sections of the decision, and we also had some
12	discussion on those particular sections.
13	On the January 5th hearing, the board had
14	gotten through Section 13 of the decision up to the
15	subcategory "Open Space and Landscaping." We have been
16	provided a draft dated January 25, 2010. Everybody
17	have it? Mr. Hussey, do you have yours? Mr. Book?
18	My understanding is that this revised draft
19	reflects
20	MR. NAGLER: The 28th, Jesse.
21	MR. JESSE GELLER: What did I say?
22	MR. NAGLER: The 25th.
23	MR. JESSE GELLER: Oh, I'm sorry. The 28th.
24	This reflects board comments and staff comments through

where we've gotten to this evening. The proposal is 1 2 that we're not going to start at the beginning, but we will pick up at the point at which we left off, which, again, is Section 14, continue through in order, and as 5 we get to those sections that were cherry picked and discussed on the 12th, I'll call those out. If anybody 6 has further comments, they can certainly raise them, but we'll then move on to the next --MS. NETTER: I would encourage you to actually 10 wait with those comments until when we go through the 11 whole decision. I think it's really important to get through the whole decision and see it as a whole and 12 13 then go back. 14 MR. HUSSEY: That makes sense. 1.5 MR. JESSE GELLER: Excellent. Let me make one 16 other note about the 1/28 version. It also has, in red 17 line format -- those red lines that you see in it are 18 staff comments subsequent to the January 12th date. Okay? So you will not see -- this is not a red-lined 19 20 version of changes made based on our comments from 21 1/5. Okay? Understood? 22 MR. HUSSEY: I think so. Now, let me get this 23 straight, though. Are we going to be working from 24 this -- the draft going forward tonight, or are we

going to be working from the earlier editions which 1 2 we've read and we've had a chance to look at? MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you, Mr. Hussey. That's an excellent question. 5 My suggestion would be that we work with the 1/28 draft, acknowledging that we are going to have to 6 look at the version we marked up and move it into 1/28. MS. NETTER: And just so you know, this is kind of hot off the press. Otherwise we would have 9 shared it with you earlier. 10 11 MR. HUSSEY: I understand. 12 MS. NETTER: This may be clear as mud, so ... 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: Exactly. 14 MS. NETTER: We try. 15 MR. BOOK: So the discussions that we had as 16 we were going along on the 1 through 14 and the 17 other -- those are not in here? 18 MS. NETTER: They are in there. They're just 19 not highlighted. 20 MR. BOOK: They're not highlighted. 21 MR. JESSE GELLER: Only red lining post 1/12. 22 MS. NETTER: We were trying to be not 23 confusing, but perhaps we were more confusing. 24 MR. BOOK: Understood. But you incorporated,

```
just did not red line, what we had --
 1
 2
               MS. NETTER: Correct.
               MR. BOOK: Great. All right.
               MR. BOOK: And we're not going to revisit
 5
      things.
              There will be an opportunity to review the
      changes, but we want to get through the entire document
 6
      in one run first, and then we'll go back.
               MR. BOOK: Understood. Thank you.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So Section 14.
10
               MR. HUSSEY: Before we start, I'd like to ask,
11
      do you have an intended deadline tonight, a time
12
      deadline?
13
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Time deadline?
14
               MR. HUSSEY: The reason I'm bringing that up
15
      is that I've got a number of things that I want to
      bring up and maybe discuss tonight, maybe not, but at
16
17
      least bring up. And I don't know whether you want to
      do those before you start this or save 15 minutes at
18
19
      the end. Now, some of the items that we go through may
20
      answer some of my questions, but there are others that
21
      will not.
22
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Things that you are
23
      raising, do they pertain to -- are they global issues?
24
      Are they administrative questions? Are they specific
```

to sections that we've reviewed or talked about, or are 1 2 they specific to sections that we have not talked about, or all of the above? MR. HUSSEY: Sort of all of the above, except 5 they're not going to be administrative questions. MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So what I would ask 6 is the following: Questions you have that relate to sections we have not covered, okay, or have not been covered, ask them as we proceed. 10 MR. HUSSEY: Exactly. 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: Questions that you have or 12 comments that you have to sections that have been 13 covered, let's hold off on those and -- but save them 14 for when we revisit the sections. Okay? 1.5 MR. HUSSEY: I understand. 16 MS. NETTER: But what if there's something 17 that doesn't fit in those categories? 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: Is there something --19 There are a few things that don't MR. HUSSEY: 20 fit into those categories, but I think we can discuss 21 those at the end of tonight's meeting because they're 22 somewhat global. I'll give you an example if you 23 want. 24 What I haven't seen yet in any of this is any

sort of opinion as to what our decision is and why and 1 2 how we've arrived at it. We have all these conditions, and we have the findings, but it seems to me it's leaving out sort of how we arrived at where we are, the 5 reasons for the decision. I'm not really familiar with 6 judicial proceedings, but it seems to me that the few things that I have followed that are judgmental issues, there are opinions issued by the judges involved. But I don't see any of that so far in the draft. Did I 10 miss something? 11 MS. NETTER: If there -- first of all, this 12 is -- you can always add. But the sections of the 13 draft are -- those are the categories that we think it 14 should fall under. And to the extent that you have 15 certain reasoning you want to share, I'd recommend you 16 put that under findings. Does that make sense to you? 17 MR. HUSSEY: That makes sense. But it is, I 18 think, a separate sort of discussion. It would be a 19 separate finding, sort of separate discussion, so 20 that's the sort of thing I'm talking about. It seems 21 to me that could go at the end or it could go now, 22 whatever you prefer. 23 MR. JESSE GELLER: No. But I think he raises 24 a good question. You know, the nub of what he's

raising is something that we have deliberately, 1 2 obviously, held off on, which is the final decision because we want to discuss sort of the structure of this. He's really getting at that. So we've actually 5 deliberately pushed -- we haven't had a discussion about it, but we deliberately pushed that -- we sort 6 of --What you're familiar with is in 40A hearings we get through the entire process, we take the 9 10 testimony, we hear from the Building Department, we 11 hear from Planning, and then we deliberate and we 12 outline our bases for why we've arrived at our 13 decision. That's the component he's talking about. 14 And because this is a more complex process --15 and as you see, we had 66 conditions. We're down to --16 MS. NETTER: They've grown. 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: They've grown? 18 MS. NETTER: Or maybe they haven't, because 19 I've got some conditions --20 MR. JESSE GELLER: Last time we were down to 21 Whatever we are, the document itself is, oddly 22 enough, reviewed at this juncture before you've even 23 had that discussion. And depending -- you know, in 24 some sense, if your decision goes one way, you tear it

- 1 up, throw it out, and you've got to write something
- 2 else.
- On the other hand, if you go a different way,
- 4 then you supplement in the findings section if you're
- 5 unhappy with some of the things or the absence of
- 6 reasons. Okay?
- 7 So I understand exactly what you're talking
- 8 about. I think -- it's not necessarily going to be a
- 9 conversation we'll have tonight, but it's a
- 10 conversation we certainly will have.
- MR. HUSSEY: Good. Okay. That's the main
- 12 thing.
- 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Section 14. So in
- 14 Section 14 -- you know what, I actually had two
- 15 comments: One was, we're referring to additional
- 16 structures, buildings, or paved surfaces when, really,
- aren't we talking about there will be no additional
- 18 material improvements, including and without limitation
- 19 these things that you've referenced? The plan is the
- 20 plan is the plan.
- 21 MS. NETTER: Probably if they put a bike rack
- there it would be okay.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Probably. But I wouldn't
- view that as material improvements. But you're making

me sort of define them today, is what you're doing, by 1 2 listing the three categories. MR. BOOK: We're making them come back to us rather than --5 MR. JESSE GELLER: We're the only ones --MS. NETTER: Everything, yeah. 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: And I'm not suggesting --I'm not trying to suggest that a bike rack is material. I don't want to see them for a bike rack. 10 MS. NETTER: No. Actually -- yeah, right. 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: But I don't know that structures, buildings, paved surfaces, or the units --12 13 MR. BOOK: Do we expect them to come back to 14 us rather than to Planning or some other designee --15 for the sake of argument say -- assume it's Planning --16 if they get their access to VFW and they want to put in 17 10 more parking spaces? 18 MS. NETTER: Well, that's Condition Number --19 MR. JESSE GELLER: That's a bad example 20 because that's something that's specifically 21 addressed. But let's say they decide, in their infinite 22 23 wisdom, that they want to extend the retaining wall 20 24 feet.

They need to come back to you so 1 MS. NETTER: 2 you can make a determination as to whether that's a substantial change or not. But that's a structure. mean, I don't know how it's defined in your bylaw, but 5 I would suspect --MR. JESSE GELLER: Are you using the -- I just 6 want to make sure we're covering everything. Other than something that is truly an immaterial -- I want to drive them back to us, and we'll make the decision whether we think it's material. 10 11 MS. NETTER: I can look at your definition of 12 structures under the bylaw. 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: I didn't know whether you 14 were using the technical definition. 1.5 MS. NETTER: Well, I can. I mean, 16 "structures" is a pretty general --17 MR. BOOK: I think a wall is a structure. 18 MR. NAGLER: There's a general requirement, 19 you know, to build it in accordance with the approved 20 plan, so you have that, you know, on top of -- it's 21 meant to be more like -- you know, it kind of tracks 22 with restriction. It's meant to be in addition to --23 MR. JESSE GELLER: It's belt and suspenders, 24 is what it is.

1 MR. NAGLER: Somewhat, yeah. 2 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So it's not intended to be words of limitation? MR. NAGLER: No. MR. JESSE GELLER: And it wouldn't be 5 interpreted to be a limitation? 6 7 MR. NAGLER: No. I don't think anyone could 8 reasonably interpret 14 to say -- this is really an 9 exception to Condition Number 1, which is they have to 10 build it. 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 12 MR. NAGLER: Whereas 15, I think, is an 13 additional requirement. 14 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 1.5 Anybody else have anything? MR. HUSSEY: On 13? 16 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: 14. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Working from the latest draft? 19 MS. NETTER: Yes. 20 MR. JESSE GELLER: They should be fairly 21 similar. 22 MR. HUSSEY: No. No questions. 23 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Book. 24 MR. BOOK: So, again, the finding that it's

insubstantial has to be made by this board? 1 2 MS. NETTER: Yes. MR. NAGLER: Even though it runs in favor of 3 the selectmen, in this case there's before the -- with 5 restrictions that are going to use the insubstantial change standard that's in the regulations for when 6 they're actually departing or when they're in violation of the restriction, if something were to be considered by the board to be an insubstantial change, then they 10 have that leeway. 11 MS. NETTER: They always have to go back to 12 you. You do it. 13 MR. BOOK: Okav. 14 MS. NETTER: I just noticed I'm citing the 15 same section with different numbers, so I'm going to 16 correct that. 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah. Five or six. 18 Okay. Section 15. 19 MS. NETTER: It's six. So I'm changing -- 14 20 will be 560611. That's my mistake. 21 No. It's 5605. Sorry. 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: Thoughts? Comments? 23 MS. NETTER: Are you on 15? 24 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah.

MR. HUSSEY: So I guess about in the middle 1 I've got a question. "The greatest extent possible 2. that the restriction may runs in perpetuity." MS. NETTER: "May run." That's a track change 5 there. MR. BOOK: So the addition of the last 6 sentence in 15, how was that different from the sentence immediately prior to it? MR. JESSE GELLER: "Independent enforcement." MS. NETTER: It's just reflecting the process 10 11 that has to be gone through. If there are to be minor 12 changes, they've got to come back to you. 13 MR. BOOK: Well, we're going into some --14 there's some description in the penultimate sentence. 15 It says, "Do not affect size, dimensions, locations ... " blah, blah, blah. Isn't it --16 17 shouldn't we just say it doesn't -- you know, changes 18 that are deemed to be insubstantial by the board? 19 Isn't that the --20 MR. NAGLER: I agree. I think we should 21 delete that second-to-last sentence. 22 MS. NETTER: The second-to-last sentence? 23 MR. HUSSEY: Yeah. The last sentence covers 24 it all.

```
1
               MR. NAGLER: Yeah. Because I think the last
 2.
      sentence kind of says it all.
 3
               MS. NETTER: Okay. Good.
 4
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Anything else?
 5
               MR. HUSSEY: No. All set.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Section 16.
 6
 7
               MR. HUSSEY: Is this intended to cover
      lighting shining on abutting buildings and what have
 9
      you?
10
               MS. NETTER: There's another section.
11
              MR. HUSSEY: That covers that?
12
              MS. NETTER: Yes.
13
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. This is just screening.
14
               MS. NETTER: Maria, there's another section;
15
      right?
16
               MS. MORELLI: Yes.
17
               MS. NETTER: I should know that, but --
18
               MR. HUSSEY: I believe there is.
19
               MS. MORELLI: If you look at Condition 18,
20
      that pertains to lighting.
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: What was the minimum depth
      that was required near the midrise for the planting?
22
23
               MR. BOOK: Three feet.
24
               MR. JESSE GELLER: It was three feet?
```

- 1 MR. BOOK: Yeah.
- 2 MR. JESSE GELLER: And the documentation
- 3 indicates that three-foot depth is feasible at the
- 4 midrise?
- 5 MS. NETTER: Maria?
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: That's in the -- I believe
- 7 we saw it in the plan.
- 8 MS. MORELLI: The three feet is what the town
- 9 arborist advises.
- 10 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right.
- MS. NETTER: But the question was: Is that
- 12 three feet feasible around --
- MR. JESSE GELLER: No. I'm asking -- I
- 14 thought those plans showed a three-foot depth. Is that
- 15 correct? Am I misremembering?
- 16 MS. NETTER: No. The statement is the plans
- aren't indicating the depth.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: So I'm misremembering.
- 19 Okay.
- MR. HUSSEY: Okay. I'd like to know why we're
- 21 putting in "where feasible."
- 22 MS. NETTER: Because our understanding is it's
- 23 not feasible in all instances. But on the other hand,
- you do get a chance -- or the town does get a chance to

review the plantings plan, the maintenance -- the 1 2 maintenance plan. And that, I think, is the ultimate goal here, that the plants will survive over time. MR. HUSSEY: Right. But -- and we're 5 specifying three feet. Who determines feasibility -or infeasibility, basically? Why not -- I don't 6 understand why you've got "where feasible." I would drop that and let them work that out in the field if they have to. I'd require it at three feet. 10 MS. NETTER: Well, the question would be -- if 11 they can't do three feet every place, they have to come 12 back to you. 13 MR. HUSSEY: Well, they just need to raise the 14 grade around the planting a little bit. 1.5 MS. MORELLI: What would happen if three feet is not feasible, if the applicant's contractor 16 17 determines that three feet is not feasible --18 MS. NETTER: But Mr. Hussey is -- I know you can hear -- saying maybe they could just --19 20 MS. MORELLI: Well, there would be other 21 alternatives. That's not necessarily the prescribed solution, but there would be other methods and means 22 23 that could -- the objective is to ensure that the

plantings survive. So if a three-foot soil depth is

24

impossible, there might be other methods or means that 1 2. would be acceptable to the town. MR. HUSSEY: Well, I'd prefer to reword it that way, then. At three feet of soil depth or 5 other -- what were your words again -- other means and 6 methods. MS. MORELLI: Other planting methods. 8 MS. NETTER: To ensure what? 9 MR. HUSSEY: To ensure viability of the 10 plants. 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: iii, where it says "three 12 feet," I want to say "not less than three feet." 13 And in your reference to maintaining, the word 14 "maintaining" would include replacement? 1.5 MS. NETTER: And replacing -- and replacing as 16 necessary. 17 MR. HUSSEY: I'm sorry. 18 MS. NETTER: So ii --19 MR. HUSSEY: Yes. 20 MS. NETTER: -- Mr. Geller is suggesting, 21 "there is an adequate plan for maintaining and 22 replacing as necessary the plantings on the site." Is 23 that good? 24 MR. HUSSEY: Well, I'm just trying to think it

- 1 through. The presumption being that some of the plants
- 2 will not survive, and so you're writing in that they
- 3 will be replaced.
- 4 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. Because maintenance
- 5 is not replacing.
- 6 MR. HUSSEY: No, it's not. All right. That's
- 7 fine.
- 8 MR. NAGLER: But we can still add the language
- 9 that you suggested.
- 10 MR. HUSSEY: Right.
- 11 MR. NAGLER: I think something like, "if it is
- determined not to be feasible, the applicant must
- 13 provide an alternative means of assuring the survival
- of the plants to the satisfaction of the planning
- 15 director."
- 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Book, anything on that?
- MR. BOOK: No. Nothing.
- 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Next section, 17.
- 19 MR. BOOK: Just a general -- I have a general
- 20 suggestion. Should, perhaps, 16 and 17 be combined?
- 21 There's a little -- I understand that the -- there's a
- 22 little bit of overlap, unless we're saying that they're
- going to submit final landscaping plans solely for the
- 24 purposes of showing what's being preserved.

1 MR. HUSSEY: I think they're separate, 2. Jonathan. I'd leave them the way they are. The first one applies to plantings and screening; the second applies to trees and rock outcroppings. MR. BOOK: Okay. 5 MR. HUSSEY: I think they're separate. 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Anything else? MR. HUSSEY: No. 9 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 18. MR. BOOK: Are we -- I'm sorry. Are we 10 11 leaving in this -- we had this discussion before --12 this concept of -- we're leaving in "and approval"? 13 MS. NETTER: Well, we could change it to --14 MR. BOOK: I mean, I think we should handle 15 this in a similar fashion throughout --MS. NETTER: I can just take out "approval." 16 17 "Review to determine whether they conform to ..." MR. BOOK: Yes. 18 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: Section 18. After the 20 phrase "or nearby property," refer to outside the 21 project. 22 MS. NETTER: Or property outside the project. 23 MR. HUSSEY: This is, I think, where my 24 comment is applicable.

1 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 2 MR. HUSSEY: The plan shows some headlight screening at the edge of parking lots by bushes and various things. In other places, it shows, you know, a 5 four-foot-high opaque fence. And in some cases there is neither. 6 Without going back and reworking every plan and detail, I think a sentence that says, "shall be shielded in accordance with the town's zoning bylaw." I'm not sure what the bylaw says about that, but "shall 10 11 be shielded by " --12 MS. MORELLI: Could I just point out to 13 Mr. Hussey, just remember, along this entire property 14 line between the Russett and Beverly Road abutters and 15 the project, there is a seven-foot-high opaque fence. MR. HUSSEY: Yes, I know. But there are 16 17 parking lots that are high enough that they reach over 18 that. 19 MS. MORELLI: Right. 20 MR. HUSSEY: And -- let's see. 21 MS. MORELLI: Do you need the bylaw? That's okay. 22 MR. HUSSEY: No. 23 MS. NETTER: What's the cite to the lighting? 24 MS. MORELLI: I'm sorry?

1 MS. NETTER: The citation to the lighting 2 section in the bylaw? It was six point something. 3 MS. MORELLI: There are two bylaws. There's 6.046B and there's 7.041. 4 5 MS. NETTER: We're trying to be consistent 6 with the bylaw. MS. MORELLI: I'll just give you page numbers. 8 Okay. So on page 6-12, and that would be 9 under 67.04.6B, and the second bylaw that's applicable is on page 7-6, section 7.04.1. 10 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: Let me ask an interim 12 question. In section 18, no higher than 15 feet? 13 MS. NETTER: Uh-huh. And there's an attached 14 exhibit as well. 1.5 MR. JESSE GELLER: And when you say, "no higher than 15 feet, " 15 feet from grade? 16 17 (Inaudible discussion. Clarification 18 requested by the court reporter.) 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: The question I asked is --20 15 feet measured from grade. 21 MS. NETTER: And it says here, "15 feet mounting height." And so it looks like it's from 22 23 grade -- Maria, is that correct -- to the bottom of the 24 fixture.

MS. MORELLI: Yes. There's an exhibit at the 1 2. back. 3 MS. NETTER: We're looking at that. Does that line down there indicate grade? 5 MS. MORELLI: No. It's from the actual base of the light pole itself. 6 7 MS. NETTER: Oh. 8 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 9 MR. HUSSEY: All right. In particular, my question on site plan L902, instead of a grade change, 10 11 it's the open parking space that's related to the 12 apartment building. And I think it doesn't show the 13 fence. There is the six-foot-high fence along the 14 property line, but whether that's going to cover the 15 headlights from the parking, which is at a slightly 16 higher grade -- let's read it again. 17 MS. NETTER: Did you say L902? 18 MR. HUSSEY: Yeah, L902. You see the plan, and there's a Section D -- which is just off the 19 20 parking lot, actually -- that appears to indicate that 21 the parking lot in that grade in general is higher than 22 the lot line, but --23 MR. JESSE GELLER: Isn't the language broad 24 enough?

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: Yeah, I think it probably is.
 2
      falls under compliance.
 3
               MS. NETTER: So is 18 okay?
               MR. HUSSEY: Yup.
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER. Okay. Anything else?
               MR. HUSSEY: No.
 6
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Section 19.
 8
      starting "Traffic and Vehicular and Pedestrian
      Circulation."
 9
10
               19 sub C, do you not mean the minimum width?
11
               MS. NETTER: Yes. Minimum is fine, but --
12
      yes.
13
               That's correct, Maria; right?
14
               MS. MORELLI: Yes.
15
               MS. NETTER: But it actually shows 23.
16
               MR. BOOK: Let me ask you a question on 19.
17
      through F, this is not currently shown on the site
18
      plans that the applicant has submitted?
19
               MS. MORELLI: Yes. So these are shown on the
20
      site plans. It's important because this is such a
21
      complex project. The building commissioner, staff
22
      really just needs a checklist to ensure this doesn't
23
      change because they're so important. So it's just a
24
      matter of clarifying. A through E are shown on the
```

```
plans, and F pertains to any construction materials
 1
 2
      that the applicant will be using on the site itself.
 3
               MS. NETTER: So that's not on the plans?
               MS. MORELLI: So that's not on the plans.
 5
               MS. NETTER: So it's belts and suspenders.
               MR. BOOK: Consistent with the comment we've
 6
      discussed a few times now, it says here, "The site
      plans, which shall be subject to the review and
      approval of the director of transportation and
      engineering, shall depict or indicate the following."
10
11
      And isn't it a matter of, again, that the -- that it's
12
      subject to his review to determine consistency?
13
               MS. NETTER: Yes. That's fine.
14
               MR. NAGLER: You do, also, have overarching
15
      language later in the conditions that all reviews have
16
      to be consistent with the regs, and there's a specific
17
      reg on the limitation of the review rights, kind of, of
18
      the local boards.
19
               MS. NETTER: That's fine.
20
               MR. NAGLER: But I think it's fine to take it
21
      out.
22
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Hussey, do you have
23
      comments?
24
               MR. HUSSEY:
                            No.
```

MS. MORELLI: Could I just point out that D is 1 2. not shown on the plans. Those are stop signs. those are not -- I just want to be clear. 4 MR. BOOK: And those -- in that instance, 5 those things that aren't shown, they should be subject to review and approval. 6 MS. MORELLI: Correct. 8 MS. NETTER: Hold it. I just took out the approval. So do you want some approval process for the 9 10 site? 11 MS. MORELLI: Yes. Anything --12 MS. NETTER: For the stop signs? 13 MS. MORELLI: Yes. Anything that's not been 14 submitted to staff before, they would have to review 15 and approve. 16 MS. NETTER: So D is not on the plans. And I 17 don't -- we want approval for F? I think we just want to know -- at least the way I read this -- where --18 19 there's four inches of blacktop; right? 20 MR. HUSSEY: No. We need more than that. 21 mean, the subbase --22 MS. NETTER: No, no. I mean do you want --23 I'm sorry I cut you off. But there's all the language 24 in here for F; right?

1 MR. HUSSEY: Yes. 2. MS. NETTER: I think we just have to determine -- at least as I read this, we're just 3 determining that this is there. So I don't think we're 5 trying to approve the type of blacktop or the type of 6 gravel, are we? MR. NAGLER: I'm sorry. I think we have a 8 definitional problem, because it says, "The site plans 9 are subject to review and approval" ... "shall depict or indicate the following." The site plan is a defined 10 11 term to just mean the specific enumerated plans. 12 MS. NETTER: I think the intention here is 13 that the plans -- oh, so go on. Maybe I'm missing 14 something. 1.5 In other words, site plans are MR. NAGLER: defined at the very beginning to include specific plans 16 17 that already exist. 18 MS. NETTER: Right. 19 MR. NAGLER: So how -- if these are not shown 20 on the, quote/unquote, site plans --21 MS. NETTER: They're going to be coming in the 22 final site plans to determine whether they're 23 consistent with the site plans, so -- that they 24 originally submitted.

So I think we're getting into a level that we 1 2 really -- I'm not sure is advancing a whole lot, but let me just contextually -- A through C, already on the plans, and the town wants them, I know, because 5 enforcement is really hard, and so it's very good to have a list. So that's A through C. And you certainly 6 don't need approval. You just have to decide if 8 they're there; right? MS. MORELLI: Correct. 10 MS. NETTER: All right. Let me just get 11 through this because otherwise we're nit-picking. 12 C -- E is on the plans; correct? Same thing 13 as A through --14 MR. JESSE GELLER: Is E completely on the 15 plans? 16 MS. MORELLI: Yes, it is. 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: I know long ago there was 18 some discussion about interconnecting and whether they 19 made sense. 20 MS. MORELLI: Yes. The applicant has shown 21 the sidewalks on the plan that were of concern. 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Thank you. 23 MS. NETTER: Okay. So A through C and E, 24 already shown, except we have language in iv, "where

- the director of transportation determines
  appropriate."
- 3 MS. MORELLI: The question?
- 4 MS. NETTER: Well, we're saying we don't need
- 5 approval. I'm not pushing for approval, but I'm also
- 6 seeing language in e, iv that says, "where the director
- 7 determines appropriate."
- 8 MS. MORELLI: Yeah. That's because the -- the
- 9 applicant has indeed designed sidewalks where they need
- 10 to be. It's nothing new. It's on the plans. That
- 11 phrase could be taken out.
- MS. NETTER: Okay. So that's just
- 13 determining.
- Now, with respect to stop signs, do we want
- some approval over the shape or the location?
- 16 MS. MORELLI: No. They're very specific about
- 17 the type of stop signs. We just want to make sure that
- 18 they are going -- they are spec'd to be located where
- 19 they're intended to be.
- 20 MS. NETTER: So it's the location and the
- 21 type?
- MS. MORELLI: Yes. There's a particular type
- of stop sign that's being spec'd here.
- MS. NETTER: And it's already spec'd?

1 MS. MORELLI: No. It's not on the plans. 2 It's in the conditions. We don't have it on the 3 plans. MR. HUSSEY: It's the R1-1. 5 MS. NETTER: So we need to make sure it's R1-1 and it's in the right place? 6 7 MS. MORELLI: Correct. 8 MS. NETTER: And then, Mr. Hussey, f, do you 9 want some approval, or is what you see what you get? 10 In other words, they do this, they're okay? 11 MR. HUSSEY: I think, although I wouldn't --12 let me back up. Just as long as this is okay with 13 Mr. Ditto in the Engineering Department --14 MS. NETTER: It is. 1.5 MR. HUSSEY: Then I would leave it in the way 16 it is. 17 MS. NETTER: So the only thing that really 18 needs approval here is D; is that right? 19 MS. MORELLI: Okay. So there has to be a site 20 detail in the plans. There's one in the porous plans 21 that's shown, but there is this ideal for impervious. 22 Construction -- the layers of the construction 23 materials --24 MS. NETTER: Right. But if they provide a

```
1
      plan that shows all of this, then it's okay; right?
 2
               MS. MORELLI: If they provide a plan, then the
      Director of Transportation and Engineering does need to
      approve it to make sure that the plans reflect the
 5
      conditions.
               MS. NETTER: Right. That's what I'm saying.
 6
      But that's just a determination. It's not like a
 8
      discretionary --
               MS. MORELLI: No, it's not discretionary.
10
               MS. NETTER: Okay. I got it. I'll work on
11
      it.
12
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Anything else on
      Section 19?
13
14
               MR. BOOK: No.
1.5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Hussey, you okay?
16
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay.
17
               MR. JESSE GELLER: All right. Section 20.
               The phrase on the sixth line, "to mitigate the
18
      adverse impacts of the project, " right, it's
19
20
      conclusory. And here's where I'm going with it: I'm
21
      concerned that that language could be read incorrectly
      to suggest that only upon approving adverse effects can
22
23
      we therefore --
24
               MS. NETTER: Okay. So "shall be redesigning
```

to" -- I don't want to say ensure pedestrian safety, 1 2 but "to further pedestrian safety" or something like that. I mean, theoretically, what you can charge fees for is to mitigate the impact of the project. I don't 5 necessarily agree with you, but I don't have a problem taking it out. It doesn't say -- I mean --6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Does anybody else have that 8 concern? MS. NETTER: I don't want to say "ensure pedestrian safety," because that's a standard that --10 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. 12 MS. NETTER: Right. You can't do that. "To 13 further pedestrian safety" or something. But really 14 that's what planning is about, to mitigate impacts. 15 MR. JESSE GELLER: Well, I understand that. MS. NETTER: I don't think it says they have 16 17 to demonstrate that. 18 MR. HUSSEY: No. I think it's okay. I've got another issue with it, but I think this issue is okay. 19 20 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Book? 21 MR. BOOK: I wasn't troubled by it. 22 understand your concern or your comment, but to the 23 extent that the purpose of the funds is for 24 mitigation -- as proposed mitigation -- as something

- 1 that isn't conclusory, but at least it infers what its
- 2 intent is, which is mitigation.
- MR. NAGLER: The word "adverse," if we deleted
- 4 the word adverse. One person's adverse could be
- 5 another person's --
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right.
- 7 MR. BOOK: Should we describe in the next line
- 8 the parenthetical -- I understood that it was all going
- 9 to construction and all those other things are town --
- 10 they're dealt with internally in the town.
- 11 MR. HUSSEY: That's exactly right. Peter
- 12 Ditto was quite clear about that. These funds are only
- 13 to be applied to construction costs; while the
- 14 engineering, contract documents, contract
- 15 administration services were to be provided by the town
- and will be absorbed by his department.
- MS. NETTER: Okay. Can we get back to
- 18 adverse? I'm going to push against -- because I don't
- 19 think it's correct what you're saying. You want to
- 20 mitigate the adverse impacts. You don't want to
- 21 mitigate the good.
- MR. HUSSEY: Right.
- MS. NETTER: That's really what you're doing.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah.

1 MS. NETTER: It's up to you, but I don't agree 2. with you. MR. BOOK: I quess, as proposed mitigation for the adverse impacts. 5 MS. NETTER: You want it to say --MR. BOOK: I thought Jesse's comment is 6 that -- simply saying that to mitigate is conclusory, 8 that it, in fact, is going to do that. And the idea is that's what it's being proffered for. So let's just remove the conclusion that it will mitigate. 10 11 being required as proposed mitigation for the adverse 12 impacts of the project. 13 MS. NETTER: Can I just say, "The proposed 14 mitigation for the impacts of the project on pedestrian 15 safety"? Take out on the word "adverse?" Do you like 16 that better, or just leave it as we've worded it? 17 MR. BOOK: I'm indifferent. Whatever you I'm indifferent. 18 prefer. 19 MS. MORELLI: Ms. Netter, I'll just point out 20 that the -- I think it was the January 12th hearing, 21 conditions 20 through 24 I believe were discussed. 22 MS. NETTER: Oh. We're doing the same thing 23 again. 24 MS. MORELLI: So at the onset you said we

- 1 would return -- revisit earlier discussed conditions.
- 2 MS. NETTER: Thank you. Yeah. Let's not redo
- 3 everything. Thank you.
- So we were up to 41, then. No. I'm sorry.
- 5 We're up to 25. 25 through 41 we're doing.
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Fire safety. And everybody
- 7 understands this is because the interim sections have
- 8 been reviewed before.
- 9 MR. BOOK: When we say in 25, "the conditions
- of the decision, " do we mean this singular condition
- 11 or --
- 12 MS. NETTER: All the conditions in the
- 13 decision.
- MR. HUSSEY: Conditions is plural.
- 15 MS. NETTER: Generally, what we say is
- 16 "conditions in the decision." You don't want me to --
- do you want me to go through and outline the
- 18 conditions?
- 19 MR. BOOK: No. I'm trying to understand the
- 20 rational that all 70 conditions, when we're done, are
- 21 subject to the review and approval of the Brookline
- 22 Fire Department, the need for that. It just seems
- 23 tremendously broad.
- MS. NETTER: Well, the alternative is only to

go through all the conditions and outline them. 1 2 MR. BOOK: I'm sorry. I didn't understand 3 that. MS. NETTER: We could limit it by going 5 through the various conditions if that's what you're looking for. 6 MR. BOOK: Well, I mean, I presume -- and correct me -- that there are certain conditions that would be of concern to the fire chief --10 MS. NETTER: Right. 11 MR. BOOK: -- and others that would --12 MS. NETTER: But generally what we've been 13 writing for each condition is consistent with the 14 conditions of the decision and we've been taking out --15 I mean, and that's not been contested. And I think the 16 fire chief is not going to --17 MR. BOOK: So we would remove -- I viewed this as being sort of heightened --18 19 MS. NETTER: It's not intended. 20 MR. BOOK: It wasn't intended. 21 MR. HUSSEY: So why don't we say "the relevant conditions"? 22 23 MR. BOOK: Well, I think what I'm hearing Edie

say is that she's going to make this consistent with

24

our other -- what we've talked about before, that's 1 2 it's -- it will be subject to review consistent with --MR. HUSSEY: So we're taking "approval" out? MR. NAGLER: Yeah. I think the way it's 5 different is that this says, "The conditions of the decision shall be subject to review and approval." 6 Usually it says, "shall be subject to review and 8 approval to ensure consistency with the conditions in the decision, " so it's kind of backwards a little 10 bit -- shall be subject to review and approval or just 11 review by the fire department to ensure consistency 12 with the conditions in the decision. 13 MS. NETTER: Is that okay with you? It's just 14 poorly worded. 1.5 MR. BOOK: Yes. 16 MS. MORELLI: May I point out that there's i 17 and ii which are not reflected on the plans, but there might be further changes to satisfy i and ii. 18 19 MS. NETTER: Okay. So "shall be 20 consistent" -- so it's two parts is what you're saying. 21 So "shall be consistent with the site plans as modified 22 below." Maybe I can take out, though, "and the 23 conditions of this decision" and relocate that. 24 "shall be subject to review by the Brookline Fire

Department to determine conformance with the 1 2. conditions." Does that work? MS. MORELLI: I think so. MS. NETTER: Yeah. Because I think it says --5 yeah. Should I read it back? MR. BOOK: Please. 6 "The site circulation and MS. NETTER: 8 emergency access roadway system and signage shall be consistent with the site plans as modified by i and ii below and shall be subject to review by the Brookline 10 11 Fire Department to determine consistency with the conditions of this decision." I think that's much 12 13 better. 14 MS. MORELLI: I just -- because i and ii are 15 not on the plans, there's nothing on the preliminary plans for the fire chief to compare something against. 16 17 So they're going to be revising the plans to ensure 18 that emergency vehicles can access and egress the fire 19 lane at the midrise. Right now it might be a little 20 tight, so the applicant might actually have to work on 21 that. They've said they would work on that. But that 22 all has to be reviewed and approved. So anything 23 that's not in the preliminary plans does need to be

review and approved.

24

```
MS. NETTER: So not just reviewed but rather
 1
 2
      approved because there's changes?
 3
               MS. MORELLI: Correct.
               MR. NAGLER: But I think the first sentence is
 5
      okay. Now we're getting to the second part.
               (Multiple parties speaking.)
 6
               MS. NETTER: So I think we need "approval" in
 8
      there, is what you're saying.
 9
               MS. STEINFELD: For i and ii.
10
               MS. MORELLI: Just for i and ii we need
11
      "review and approval." The rest of it is just "review
12
      for consistency."
13
               MS. NETTER: I'll work on it.
14
               MR. JESSE GELLER: We also have to take out
15
      the word "that" in the next sentence.
16
               MS. NETTER: I actually reread that but -- so
17
      that emergency vehicles can enter and egress -- oh,
18
      yes, yes.
19
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Anything else on that?
20
               (No audible response.)
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 26.
22
               Was it emergency egress only, or was it access
23
      and egress?
24
               MS. NETTER: I believe it was both, but --
```

1 MS. MORELLI: It's both. 2 MR. JESSE GELLER: It is? Oh, I thought it 3 was just egress. 4 MR. HUSSEY: No. 5 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. MR. BOOK: Do we want to say in 26 "provide 6 and maintain, " or is that implicit? 8 MS. NETTER: I don't have a problem with saying "and maintain." 9 10 MR. BOOK: You say that in the next 11 condition. 12 I'd better go through MS. NETTER: Yeah. 13 every place because I probably have "provide" all the 14 way through this decision, so "provide and maintain" --1.5 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah. As long as you're 16 consistent. 17 MS. NETTER: I will double check it, Mr. Book, but I'm thinking to leave out the word "maintain," 18 19 otherwise I'm going to have to triple check every time 20 I use the word "provide." 21 If you want me to do some general definition 22 at the end saying whenever I say "provide" it's also 23 "provide and maintain." 24 MR. JESSE GELLER: You could cover all bases,

- 1 provide, maintain, and replace as necessary, and that
- 2 will pick up the prior section. So the addition, there
- 3 will be a global definition of "provide," which will be
- 4 "provide, maintain, and replace as necessary."
- 5 MR. HUSSEY: Actually, doesn't 27 belong with
- 6 26 which covers this issue?
- 7 MR. BOOK: Oh, so now you want to start
- 8 combining conditions.
- 9 MR. HUSSEY: I mean, that's where the
- 10 "maintain" is, already there, and it ...
- MR. JESSE GELLER: You're offending Mr. Book's
- 12 sense of fair play.
- 13 MR. BOOK: Just wanted to put a little bit of
- 14 humor in this.
- MS. NETTER: Are we up to 28?
- 16 MR. BOOK: We are -- I am. I have no comments
- 17 on 28.
- 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: I might. I'm a slow
- 19 reader.
- I don't have anything.
- MR. HUSSEY: I'm all set.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 29.
- MR. BOOK: So 29, applicant shall certify to
- 24 who? Would it be to the fire chief?

Page 43

MS. NETTER: To the fire chief? 1 2 MR. BOOK: Building Department? MS. MORELLI: It could be the fire chief and 3 4 the Building Department. 5 MS. NETTER: Let's just do one. One certification is enough. 6 7 MR. HUSSEY: But let me ask a question. 8 mean, these items are all in the drawings and in the 9 specifications. 10 MS. MORELLI: No. That's not correct. 11 these three things are over and beyond the building 12 code. They can't be physically represented on the 13 plans. 14 MR. HUSSEY: No. I don't understand. I mean, 15 in order for them to be built, they're going to have to be shown on the construction drawings and specified in 16 17 the specifications. 18 MS. MORELLI: And they're not shown in the 19 preliminary plans. 20 MR. HUSSEY: Oh, they're not shown on these 21 plans? 22 MS. MORELLI: Right. 23 I understand that. Okay. MR. HUSSEY: Then I 24 guess -- so how's he going to certify? Is he going to

- 1 write a letter and certify? Or what's the --
- 2 MS. MORELLI: I would just ask the building
- 3 commissioner.
- 4 MR. BENNETT: Some sort of letter or something
- 5 in writing -- preliminary. It will be reviewed by the
- 6 building and fire department.
- 7 MR. HUSSEY: Right. So this is between the
- 8 time when they get this decision cleared up and they
- 9 submit the construction drawings, you want a letter of
- 10 certification?
- 11 MR. BENNETT: Yes.
- MR. HUSSEY: Okay.
- 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: And is the certification --
- is that the sole conclusion? You said you're going to
- 15 be looking at the plans at the same time.
- 16 MR. BENNETT: No. Then at a later date -- at
- some point in time they'll be coming in with the final
- 18 construction plans that will show -- I think there's
- 19 three things here. The sprinkler system and standpipe
- 20 are shown on the fire protection plans. The third
- 21 connection is something strictly with the fire
- department.
- MS. NETTER: I missed something either from
- 24 Mr. Hussey or Mr. Bennett. At what time do you want

1 the certification? At what stage? 2 MR. BENNETT: It would be prior to a building 3 permit application. 4 MS. NETTER: Is it part of the application? 5 MR. BENNETT: Eventually, yes. But they might want to start the work -- commencement of 6 construction -- do some clearing. 8 MS. NETTER: So before commencement of construction? 9 10 MR. BENNETT: No. I wouldn't need it then. 11 But what I'm saying is the reason we're looking for the 12 certification is they're not going to install sprinkler 13 systems right away. They can apply for a building 14 permit that indicates that there's some sort of a 15 system there at a later date. You've got shop drawings 16 from the fire protection engineer that provides all 17 that information as reviewed by both departments, fire 18 and building. 19 MS. NETTER: I'm sorry. I'm still missing 20 Do you want me to say "prior" --21 MR. BENNETT: If you say "prior to building 22 permit application, "that'll work. 23 MS. NETTER: "Before building permit

application"?

24

```
1
               MR. BENNETT: Sure.
 2
               MS. NETTER: Okay.
 3
               MR. HUSSEY: Dan, one question. Is this --
 4
      the apartment building is going to be under the
 5
      controlled construction clause of the building code?
               MR. BENNETT: Yes.
 6
 7
               MR. HUSSEY: Will all the infill buildings be
      under that as well because it's one project, or ...
 8
 9
               MR. BENNETT: No. There will be separate
      permit applications for each building.
10
11
               MR. HUSSEY: And those might not require
12
      controlled --
13
               MR. BENNETT: No. I think, based on -- I
14
      think they're all controlled construction.
1.5
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Good. All right. Are we
16
      not going to need certification on a lot of other stuff
17
      in here that isn't shown on the drawings yet in
18
      detail? Once we start this --
19
               MR. BENNETT: The reason we're looking for --
20
      these are above and beyond what the building code would
21
      require. They're agreeing to go beyond what the code
22
      requires.
23
               MR. HUSSEY:
                            Okay. Fine.
                                          Thank you.
24
               MR. JESSE GELLER: In what used to be (d),
```

```
"Direct fire department alarm notification for
 1
 2.
      Buildings 1 through 12," isn't it all the buildings?
 3
               MS. NETTER: That is all the buildings.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Why not just say, "all the
 5
      buildings"?
               MS. NETTER: That's fine with me. You want
 6
      all buildings? I'll make the change in (b) and in (d).
 8
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Anything else on
 9
      that?
10
               (No audible response.)
11
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Stormwater,
12
      Section 30.
13
               MS. NETTER: I'm just going to take out
14
      "approval," the first sentence in 30, because it's just
15
      "reviewed to ensure that the plans are consistent."
      Don't need "approval." Is that okay?
16
17
               MS. MORELLI: You have to repeat that.
18
               MS. NETTER: I'm sorry. On 30, "The applicant
19
      shall submit final stormwater management plans for
20
      review by the director to ensure that ... " I don't
21
      think we need "approval." This is just consistency,
22
      that there's a breakdown, that there's no standing
23
      water.
24
               MS. MORELLI: Well, that's -- I mean, that
```

- 1 there's no standing water on low lying areas of the
- 2 site. I believe their stormwater plan would avoid
- 3 that, but ...
- 4 MS. NETTER: I'm just saying all we want to do
- is make sure these things are true. We don't need a
- 6 whole approval process here; right?
- 7 MS. MORELLI: I just need to make sure that
- 8 there's something beyond checking for consistency.
- 9 MS. NETTER: Right.
- MS. MORELLI: And that's not true because we
- don't get -- under (a), they have not submitted specs
- for the grass, concrete paving. They have to amend
- 13 their O&M plans and stormwater report to provide their
- 14 specs. They have not yet selected the brand of
- 15 concrete.
- 16 MS. NETTER: But what's the approval that we
- want? We don't want to approve the brand of concrete
- 18 they use, do we?
- 19 MS. MORELLI: Yeah. We want to ensure that
- 20 they've actually amended their stormwater --
- 21 MS. NETTER: But you don't need an approval.
- 22 You just need a determination whether they've done it.
- MS. MORELLI: Okay. Unless -- I'd have to say
- yes, unless there's something that I missed, and

Peter's not here. 1 MS. NETTER: Okay. Well, this is not going to be written in stone yet. MS. MORELLI: Okay. 5 MS. NETTER: Any comments on 30, assuming it is okay with the director with respect to the deletion 6 of the word "approval." MR. BOOK: I have no comments. MS. NETTER: Okay. 31? 32? 10 MR. BOOK: I have no comments. 11 MS. NETTER: 33? 12 MR. BOOK: I assume everyone else is agreeing 13 with --14 MS. NETTER: Everybody's got to speak their 15 I don't think we have to call each time. that okay, Mr. Chairman? 16 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yes. 18 MS. NETTER: Are we up to water? 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yes. 20 MS. NETTER: So we're up to number 34? 21 MR. BOOK: I have a question about 34. How does the certification -- it's not clear to me how 22 23 certification will demonstrate the adequacy of water 24 flow and pressure.

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: I don't think it does,
 2.
      necessarily. I mean, the engineer for the fire system
      and the sprinkler is going to have to sign and stamp
      his drawings. And those drawings, by implication,
 5
      require that the water pressure be available for those
      particular components.
 6
 7
               MS. NETTER: Are you saying this word -- I
 8
      think this is Mr. Ditto's?
               MR. HUSSEY: The certification?
10
               MS. MORELLI: The fire chief.
11
               MS. NETTER: Oh, the chief. Sorry.
12
               Are you saying this is acceptable language, or
13
      vou think it's not?
14
               MR. HUSSEY: I think it's somewhat redundant.
1.5
               MS. NETTER: Pardon?
16
               MR. HUSSEY: I think the engineering stamp is
      basically certifying, but if you want this before the
17
      building permit application, then it's appropriate.
18
19
               MS. NETTER: So put "prior to application."
20
      It's not part of the application, but "prior to
21
      application for building."
22
               MR. HUSSEY: It's the same thing.
23
      somewhat similar -- or not quite. Previous
24
      certification, as Mr. Bennett was talking about, was
```

- 1 because these items are above and beyond what the
- 2 building code requires. But the codes and good
- 3 practice for engineering in this case does require that
- 4 these water pressures be adequate to support the
- 5 sprinkler service. So I'm just not quite --
- 6 MS. NETTER: You don't know if it's
- 7 necessary?
- 8 MR. HUSSEY: Yeah. I guess I don't know that
- 9 it's necessary. Was this made specifically by the fire
- 10 chief, this certification request?
- 11 MS. MORELLI: I think it was just a matter of
- just a checklist. Again, this does have to meet code.
- 13 MR. HUSSEY: I don't want to take it out if
- it's specifically requested for some reason I'm not
- aware of, but it seems to me redundant.
- 16 MS. NETTER: But we don't loose anything by
- including it and nobody's contesting --
- 18 MR. HUSSEY: No.
- MR. BOOK: So, again, who's making the
- 20 certification?
- MR. HUSSEY: The applicant.
- 22 MR. BOOK: I think this is different from the
- 23 fire protection system. The fire protection system was
- 24 certification that they're going to include it. The

applicant is in a position to say what they are or are 1 2 not going to include in their project. This one is -there's a conclusion here that there's adequate water flow and pressure and my guess is -- I don't know --5 but that's probably -- a certification like that should be coming from somebody who is qualified to --6 MR. HUSSEY: That should be the engineers. MR. BOOK: Okay. MR. HUSSEY: And they will be making the drawings and stamping those drawings, which is their 10 11 certification that everything is correct. 12 MR. JESSE GELLER: Sometimes you see redundant certifications. 13 14 MS. NETTER: But maybe it should be the 15 applicant's engineer, is that what you're looking for? 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yes. 17 MS. NETTER: Are we up to 35? 18 MR. HUSSEY: Yes. 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: "Standards and practices 20 applicable to the town with respect to town property"? 21 MS. NETTER: Yeah. I think the town -- that 22 was acceptable to the town. 23 Correct, Maria? 24 MS. MORELLI: Yes.

```
MR. HUSSEY: I think the question here is:
 1
 2.
      When does that need to be submitted, certificate of
 3
      occupancy or building --
               MS. NETTER: That's a good question, isn't
 5
      it?
               MS. MORELLI: It's after each application.
 6
 7
               MR. HUSSEY: Application?
 8
               MS. MORELLI: Well, reports are submitted
      after each application.
 9
10
               MS. NETTER: No, but the plan, when do we want
11
     the plan?
12
               MR. HUSSEY: The mosquito control plan.
13
               MS. MORELLI: Honestly, I don't know the
14
      standard practice.
               MS. NETTER: Well, right now I'm going to
1.5
      write "prior to blank," and if we would ask this chief
16
17
      when he or she wants it, that would be great. Does
18
      that work, Maria?
19
               MS. MORELLI: Yes.
20
               MS. NETTER: That's a good catch, Mr. Hussey.
21
     Thank you.
22
               MR. HUSSEY: You're welcome.
23
               MS. NETTER: Are we up to 36?
24
               MR. HUSSEY: Yup.
```

```
1
               MR. BOOK: 36, there should be some time
 2.
      period if they receive it in terms of turning it
               That can't do it instantaneously.
               MS. NETTER: Within fourteen days of receival
 5
      or within seven days? I don't care. What do you want
 6
      me to put in?
               MR. BOOK: I think the applicant had suggested
 8
      ten, so --
 9
               MS. NETTER: Okay. Within ten days.
10
               MR. BOOK: -- we can accept that.
11
              MS. NETTER: Are we up to 37?
12
              MR. HUSSEY: Yes.
13
               MS. NETTER: By the way, just so you know,
14
      unless somebody hits me over the head with this, I'm
15
      not intending to renumber everything. I've never
16
      written a decision like this where I have intentionally
17
      deleted, but there's so much cross-referencing in here
18
      that, with your acquiescence, I'm going to leave it
19
      like that.
20
               MR. BOOK: That's fine with me.
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 37, "Operation maintenance
22
      or repair or replace."
23
               MS. NETTER: Or repair or replace.
24
               MR. JESSE GELLER: That should really be,
```

```
"Operation maintenance, repair, or replace."
 1
 2
               MR. BOOK: I'm good with 38.
 3
               MS. NETTER: Does that mean you finished 37?
               MR. BOOK: I did finish 37.
 4
 5
               MS. NETTER: So are we on 39?
               MR. BOOK: I'm on 39, yes.
 6
 7
               MS. NETTER: Are we up to 40?
 8
               MR. HUSSEY: Back up.
               Maria?
 9
10
               MS. MORELLI: Yes?
11
               MR. HUSSEY: Is this correct, "The approval of
12
      the director of transportation and engineering"?
13
      There's the DPW and then there's the engineering. Is
14
      there transportation?
15
               MS. MORELLI: Peter Ditto is the head of
      transportation and engineering, and under him is DPW.
16
17
               MR. HUSSEY: Oh, okay.
18
               MR. BOOK: So on 39 we have some stormwater.
19
      What is -- I guess I want to understand what is
20
      lacking.
21
               MS. NETTER: I think this is actually the
22
      design of the facility.
23
               Is that right, Maria? It's another --
24
               MS. MORELLI: Well, without Peter being
```

here -- there could be, I imagine -- the applicant 1 2 could make changes. I mean, there are only submitted preliminary plans, so if they make changes, we wouldn't want them to be inconsistent with the preliminary 5 plans, so --MS. NETTER: I just want to understand 6 something. We have all their facility designs 8 already? MS. MORELLI: I really can't speak --10 MS. NETTER: Okay. Can we get back to you on 11 this? 12 MR. BOOK: Okay. 13 MS. NETTER: Good? 14 MS. MORELLI: Yes. 1.5 MR. HUSSEY: We've seen the preliminary 16 schematic design, the development design, but the final 17 construction designs have not been included, not 18 totally. 19 MR. BOOK: No. Right. But we are delegating 20 to the town officials who are the appropriate -- or 21 better suited to do this, to review those final 22 construction drawings for consistency with what has 23 been submitted to this board. 24 MR. HUSSEY: And also compliant to the town

and state laws and regulations. 1 2 MR. BOOK: Right. And so I just -- I was questioning 39 because it is rather broad where it 3 talks about review and approval and so --5 MS. NETTER: My guess is there's town bylaws 6 on this anyway. Maybe just chat with Peter. I actually don't think it's broad, but let's go back to 8 Peter and find out. It might be just a statement of what the bylaws provide, so let's double check it. 10 Can we move on to 40? 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: I don't have any comment. 12 MR. HUSSEY: Hang on a second on 40. I think 13 I've got something on 40. Generally, I'm just sort of 14 curious as to why you struck "weekly" and put in 15 "monthly" on the --16 MS. NETTER: It was acceptable to the town, 17 but --18 MS. MORELLI: Correct. It was acceptable to 19 Peter Ditto who is the director of transportation and 20 engineering. 21 MS. NETTER: My guess is it was in the 22 applicant's recommendation or request and he reviewed 23 it, but --24 MS. MORELLI: The applicant proposed

quarterly. 1 2 MS. NETTER: Oh, okay. And for us, the town, 3 monthly was okay? 4 MS. MORELLI: Yes. MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Fine. 5 MS. NETTER: Although we had said -- we've 6 already discussed 41. 41 we had deferred most of it 8 because I said let's wait until we go through the whole decision. 9 10 MS. MORELLI: Correct. 11 MS. NETTER: But I actually think most of 12 these conditions, with the exception of 65, we've 13 already -- and 69 we haven't done. So we can either 14 look at this or wait until we've done the whole 15 decision. 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: You mean Section 41? 17 MS. NETTER: Correct. Thank you for helping me be more precise. Would you like to discuss 41 now 18 19 or wait until we've completed everything? 20 MR. BOOK: 41 was the checklist? 21 MS. NETTER: Correct. 22 MR. HUSSEY: Was there any reason why it was 23 placed here rather than at the end of the conditions? 24 MS. NETTER: Don't ask me to renumber.

There's too much risk. 1 2 MR. HUSSEY: No, I won't ask that. 3 MS. NETTER: Because there's kind of a logical 4 order, Mr. Hussey: prebuilding permit review, 5 construction, and then --6 MR. HUSSEY: I see. Yup, okay. 7 MS. NETTER: -- and then there's general, so there is a method. 8 9 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. That's fine. So let's leave it in. 10 11 MS. NETTER: Yeah. I think it's simply a reflection of things said elsewhere. I'm trying to 12 13 think. The (d), "the preconstruction meeting," that's 14 not said elsewhere. 15 MR. HUSSEY: How about (e)? 16 MS. NETTER: The second part of -- yeah, 17 (e) --18 MR. HUSSEY: I'm not sure that this comes under -- I know there was this business about funding 19 20 and what have you, but I'm not sure the construction 21 comes under the jurisdiction of the Mass Historical 22 Commission. 23 MS. NETTER: I'm sorry. I'm not quite sure 24 how -- I'm not sure what you're saying.

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: Well, under "prebuilding permit
 2.
      review, " under (e), "The applicant should demonstrate
      to the satisfaction of the building commissioner that:
      (e), all required local, state, and federal approval,
 5
      including from the Massachusetts Historical Commission
 6
      . . . "
               MR. NAGLER: Well, Mass Historic -- if they go
      for bond financing, any bond financing requires that
 9
      Mass Historic --
                                 The question is: At what
10
               MS. NETTER: No.
11
      juncture, he's asking.
12
               Is that correct?
13
               MR. HUSSEY: It's not --
14
               MS. NETTER: Why don't we look into that?
1.5
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Under certain very
16
      definite conditions, the requirement -- the approval of
17
      the Mass Historical Commission is required before you
18
      proceed, before you get a building permit, if the
19
      building department is aware of it.
20
               But if there's a deed restriction on the
21
      property, for instance, then they have the right of
22
      design approval.
23
               MS. NETTER: Oh, I see.
                                        What type of
24
      approval, is what you're saying.
```

1 MR. HUSSEY: Yes. 2 MS. NETTER: Okay. Let's work on that. 3 MR. NAGLER: But I think -- first of all, it 4 says, "all required approvals." 5 MS. NETTER: Oh. MR. NAGLER: If it's required, they have to 6 It kind of goes without saying, if you will. get it. 8 And the regs specifically provide for that condition. 9 MR. HUSSEY: Tell me more about the bonding issue, though. Does this -- the project gets bonded 10 11 before they start construction? 12 MS. NETTER: I think he's talking about 13 financing. 14 MR. NAGLER: Not a construction bond. It's a 15 different type of bond altogether. 16 MR. HUSSEY: So it's financing? 17 MR. NAGLER: Bond financing, financing through the issuance of taxes and bonds, which is what Mass 18 19 Development is proposing to do here for their 20 financing. Yeah, sorry. Two entirely different types 21 of bonding. MR. HUSSEY: I think I'd like to have it 22 23 qualified a little bit. 24 MS. NETTER: What would you like to have

1 qualified? 2. MR. HUSSEY: The Massachusetts Historical 3 Commission approval. MS. NETTER: You know what, can we take out 4 5 the highlighted verbiage? MR. NAGLER: Yeah, we could take it out. If 6 it's required, it's required; if it's not required, 8 it's not required. 9 MS. NETTER: Yeah. It'll just say, "All required local, state, and federal approval for the 10 11 permits have been obtained." 12 MR. HUSSEY: I think that would be --13 MS. NETTER: Done. MR. NAGLER: There were a lot of comments from 14 15 neighbors specifically on Mass Historical. 16 MS. NETTER: But we have another condition. 17 MR. HUSSEY: Yeah. No, I understand that. 18 MS. NETTER: We're good with 41? 19 MR. HUSSEY: Except the preliminary rubbish 20 plan. Is this the rubbish plan during construction 21 or --MS. NETTER: There's two different rubbish 22 23 plans. How about we wait until we get to 69, if that's 24 all right.

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay.
 2
               MS. NETTER: So 42, are we good with 42?
 3
               MR. JESSE GELLER: I'm one behind you.
 4
               MS. NETTER: You're at 41?
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Uh-huh.
 6
               MS. NETTER: Oh, sorry.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: And the reason you don't
      cite blasting here is because you covered it otherwise?
 8
 9
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
10
               MR. HUSSEY: So are we on 42 now?
11
               MR. BOOK: Just in 41, back to (f), why are
      we -- "evidence of recording" -- you want evidence of
12
13
      recording of the restriction on further development but
14
      not on the easement? It's a consistency matter.
15
               MS. NETTER: True.
16
               MR. NAGLER: Good point.
17
               MS. NETTER: I think I've got -- I have to
18
      change (f) because (f) -- we're no longer looking --
19
      yeah. I'm going to alter iii, (f) iii, and we can get
20
      into that discussion when we go back to the earlier
21
     housing conditions.
22
               Are we on 42?
23
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 42? Yes? No?
                                                  Nothing?
24
               MR. HUSSEY: I'm thinking. Let me think for a
```

Page 64

```
minute here.
 1
 2
               Okay on 42.
 3
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Book?
               MR. BOOK: I'm okay on 42.
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 43 we've covered?
               MS. NETTER: Yes. 43 and 44 we covered.
 6
      we're up to 45.
               MR. HUSSEY: Wait a minute. You're going
      right to 45?
 9
10
               MS. NETTER: We've discussed 43 and 44
11
     previously.
12
               MR. BOOK: I have a -- just a generic question
13
      on 45. Does the building department -- is two years a
14
      reasonable period of time to construct the project?
1.5
               MS. NETTER: Where this came from was the
      applicant or one of their consultants said -- whether
16
17
      they said it would definitely be done in two years or
18
      they anticipated their construction period would be two
19
      years, I haven't gone back and reread the transcript,
20
      but that number was thrown out.
21
               And so what we did is said no more than two
22
      years subject to causes beyond the applicant's
23
      reasonable control because our understanding is that's
24
      what the applicant believes. I mean, I think their
```

- preference would be not to have a time limit at all, but that was held out as something anticipated, so
- 3 there is some wiggle room in there. But it's your call
- 4 if you want it there or not. And there is the
- 5 opportunity to come back for an extension through the
- 6 amendment process if it's not workable.
- 7 MR. BOOK: I sort of -- I understand it on a
- 8 building-by-building basis. For example, the midrise,
- 9 they should be able to build that in two years. I just
- 10 don't know if it was the expectation that they were
- going to be essentially constructing all twelve
- buildings at the same time or if they would --
- 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: It's not a phased project.
- MS. NETTER: They said it's not a phased
- 15 project. It's completely up to you.
- 16 MR. HUSSEY: I think it's a little tight,
- 17 quite frankly. I noticed the applicant raised a
- 18 question of is the two years jeopardizing
- 19 financeability. Do you have any remarks on that?
- MR. NAGLER: I think, you know, there's three
- 21 qualifiers in here. It doesn't say, you shall build
- this in two years or you're in violation.
- 23 Qualifier Number 1 is you make feasible
- efforts.

1 Qualifier Number 2 is that it's subject to 2 causes beyond the applicant's reasonable control. Oualifier Number 3 is even if Oualifier Number 1 and Qualifier Number 2 don't help you, just come back 5 to the board and ask for an extension. So personally, I don't think that would render the project 6 unfinanceable. You look troubled. MR. BOOK: I understand that they said it's 10 not a phased project. I'm just -- I quess I was 11 finding it hard to believe that they'd be building all 12 12 buildings at the same time. 13 MS. NETTER: They didn't say simultaneously, 14 but they did say we're not coming in -- because 1.5 originally we had written in the construction 16 management plan phases and we talked about different 17 COs and we were told, no, it's one project. 18 MR. BOOK: Do you have trouble with this? 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: No. That is what they 20 said. 21 MR. HUSSEY: I concur. 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: Because I specifically 23 asked a question about whether there are multiple COs, 24 which there are, on a building-by-building basis.

- 1 MR. BOOK: Right.
- 2 MR. JESSE GELLER: And the question about
- 3 phasing, because I did have that concern.
- 4 MR. BOOK: All right. And you think 12 -- and
- 5 this is out of my -- I realize I'm treading on an area
- 6 that's out of my area.
- 7 MR. HUSSEY: I think two years is a little
- 8 tight, but it can be done. It's not that this is a
- 9 complicated project. It is not complicated. It's just
- 10 that there's a lot of work spread over a lot of area.
- 11 It requires one contractor but not workforce, you know,
- 12 to start on all these buildings.
- 13 MR. JESSE GELLER: Is your concern you just
- don't want them to needlessly have to come back here
- 15 for an extension?
- 16 MR. BOOK: It's two things. One is, I'm
- trying to minimize the instances where they do have to
- 18 come back. And so if I've seen something that is
- 19 almost bordering on a likelihood that they're going to
- 20 have to have to come back, I want to try to cut that
- 21 off or prevent that.
- The other piece of it is that I'm just trying
- 23 to -- while I understand it was used before with
- respect to, I think, when the applicant was talking

- about blasting, sort of pulling the Band-Aid off, 1 2 getting it done as quickly as possible to -- that way it's not prolonged. But I'm -- part of me is wondering what is the 5 impact on the neighborhood of 12 buildings essentially going up simultaneously. And maybe it's -- it's going 6 to be an awful lot of construction trucks and material trucks and I just wonder if it would be better that it -- I don't know -- be --10 MR. JESSE GELLER: Are you raising the 11 question of whether there ought to be a condition in here in which we say, "and you have to build it in 12 13 phases"? Is that where you're leading with this? 14 MR. BOOK: No. No. It's a good question. 15 That's not my thought. I guess I'm questioning whether 16 or not they really --
- 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: With all due respect, it's
- 18 not our job to second-quess, you know, how they propose
- 19 to build this. They told us that they don't plan on
- 20 phasing. And whether or not they can accomplish this
- 21 within two years, I have no basis on which to say
- 22 whether they can or cannot.
- MR. BOOK: When you say "phasing," do you view
- 24 it as if they started at --

1 MR. JESSE GELLER: They decide to build out E1 2. first. MR. BOOK: Starting with 1 and moving to 2, moving to 3, do you consider that phasing? So, for 5 example --MR. JESSE GELLER: The language here is that 6 they have to build out the entire project, E1, E2. 8 Right? It's all the various lots that comprise this project. They have to build out all of it within two 10 years as distinct from they've got to build the midrise 11 within the two years and then they'll come in and apply 12 for the townhomes. 13 MR. BOOK: Let's start -- starting with 14 Building 1, they start at Building 1 and they start 15 moving down the line, you know, 1 through 11 -- I guess 16 I viewed it as starting at 1 and then moving on down 17 the line and maybe -- not that they're going to start 1 18 through 11 all at the same time so that everything can 19 be done. 20 MR. JESSE GELLER: I rely on them to tell me 21 their preferred methodology of constructing this thing, 22 whether it's in pieces or as a whole. And I'm not 23 going to look behind me. The question -- it's a fair 24 question whether the allotment of time -- given what

- 1 they've proposed to do, which is a single project --
- 2 whether that allotment of time is adequate. I have --
- 3 you know, I have no idea whether it's sufficient to
- 4 accomplish what they need to accomplish, building 12
- 5 buildings, paving area. I don't know. But I assume
- 6 they've thought that through.
- 7 MR. BOOK: And, again, the 24 months came from
- 8 where? The two years came from --
- 9 MS. NETTER: The applicant. But whether it
- 10 was specifically Mr. Levin or one of Mr. Levin's
- 11 consultants, I don't recall.
- 12 MS. MORELLI: I believe Mr. Levin didn't
- 13 commit to two years, but provided it as an example.
- 14 MS. NETTER: Oh, it wasn't a commitment?
- 15 MS. MORELLI: I don't recall it being a
- 16 commitment. It was an example of when it could be
- 17 done.
- 18 MS. NETTER: All right.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: So maybe this is a question
- 20 for Mr. Bennett.
- 21 MS. NETTER: Well, let me just say something.
- 22 I had understood that this was something that was put
- forward by the applicant. That was my understanding.
- 24 It would be very unusual for -- it would not be

- 1 typical. And so generally when I draft, if I hear
- 2 something the applicant represents, I'm very quick to
- memorialize it. Right? But you're saying it wasn't
- 4 something that was represented.
- 5 MS. MORELLI: I don't recall that. We could
- 6 look at the transcripts. I would just have to -- I
- 7 don't know offhand what hearing that was, if you wanted
- 8 to go back, but my recollection is that it was not a
- 9 commitment. It was an example of -- it was a ballpark
- 10 figure, but not a commitment.
- 11 MS. NETTER: It was a ballpark figure. So
- what's put forward is generally what was anticipated,
- 13 not, like, absolutely. Yeah, okay. So now I think
- 14 that's correct.
- 15 MR. BOOK: Can I -- I'd like to hear ...
- 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: Is it a question? What do
- 17 you want to ask?
- 18 MR. BOOK: I want to ask, is it reasonable --
- MS. NETTER: Mr. Bennett?
- 20 MR. BOOK: Mr. Bennett. I want to ask of
- 21 Mr. Bennett, in his experience would it be reasonable
- 22 to build out a project of this magnitude in 24 months?
- 23 It just strikes me as a really short period of time,
- but what do I know? So I'd like to ask him, do you

have some knowledge about this? 1 2 MR. JESSE GELLER: Well, remember the tension that you're speaking to. The tension you're speaking to is between feasibility and not wanting the applicant 5 to -- not wanting to set them on a course where they have to come back to us needlessly. 6 MR. BOOK: Correct. MR. JESSE GELLER: Versus not wanting a lengthy period of construction, which is certainty not 9 in the interest of the neighborhood. Okay? 10 11 your tension. 12 MR. BOOK: Well, no. But I think there's a --13 the second part, I don't know if that's necessarily 14 true. I think that doing a massive scale project in 15 a -- too short of a time could have a negative impact 16 on the neighborhood. I think it's bringing --17 MR. JESSE GELLER: Do you want to ask your 18 question? 19 MR. BOOK: I do. 20 Mr. Bennett? 21 MR. BENNETT: My recollection was that there 22 was a reference to a two-year period of time. How 23 serious that statement was, I don't specifically 24 recall. But two years to build this out would probably

be a tight time frame based on the amount of blasting. 1 2 I would put most of it on the time of blasting. In addition, they can build portions of the site simultaneously. I'm not sure if they're going to 5 get the same contractor to build the midrise that they are going to use to build the smaller eight-unit 6 buildings. They could bring two people in. One would be doing the midrise, the other would start in the smaller units and build them out simultaneously. They could start in the western lot, in the VFW lot, and 10 11 work their way into the middle. There's many different 12 approaches that you could have here. 13 But could it be done? Yes. Is it tight? 14 But they do have -- one of, I think, the issues 1.5 was we did not want this dragged out, and if there 16 was -- they were hitting that two-year period, then 17 come back to the board and explain what was going on. 18 In addition, under the construction management 19 plan, there is a provision in there that they provide 20 us with a phasing of the construction. How do they 21 intend to build this out? And when we get to that 22 point, if it becomes an issue that they don't look like 23 they can make the 24-month period, then even prior to 24 constructing they might be able to come back to the

board and figure that out when they get a contractor on 1 2 board. I'm not sure who they've spoken with, how they're bidding it out, and a host of other issues. MR. BOOK: So would you think that in a 5 project of this size that it's almost a certainty that they're going to need to come back to the board for --6 I'm just trying to -- I want to -- as Chairman Geller 8 indicated, there's a balancing and I just want to make sure that we're -- and it doesn't sound like that they 10 necessarily committed to 24 months. Maybe it was 11 mentioned; maybe it was suggested. I think that's 12 different than making it a condition. And so I guess I 13 would ask you, what would you --14 MR. BENNETT: I would say there's probably 15 more than a 50 percent chance they'd come back and ask for an extension. 16 17 MR. BOOK: Do you have a sense of what would be a more reasonable period of time? 18 19 MS. NETTER: Let's -- I think we've got to go 20 back to ourselves and --21 MR. BOOK: Okay. 22 MS. NETTER: -- stop the conversation. 23 MR. BOOK: I'm not allowed to ask those --24 MS. NETTER: I think you can ask clarifying

questions, but we're starting --1 2 MR. BOOK: All right. Fair enough. MR. HUSSEY: Let me say I concur with everything that Mr. Bennett said. I think I mentioned 5 earlier that I thought it was a tight schedule and it's a complicated project. As Mr. Bennett points out, 6 there may be different contractors involved. 8 segmented sites, the midrise buildings, each of those could be built within a year easily. 10 The apartment building is going to take longer 11 and there are complexities in the apartment building 12 with the amount of blasting that may need to be done. 13 There's complexity in the site work, the drainage in 14 particular, throughout the project. I would concur 1.5 with him there's a 50/50 chance they're going to come back and ask for an extension. 16 17 I agree that the urgency of getting the work done then limits the problems for the neighbors and 18 what have you, but if they're going to have to sort of 19 20 ramp times -- things up and things happen faster and 21 more trucks being there at the same time, that's not to 22 the advantage of the neighbors either, I don't think. 23 People are moving faster and they're working overtime 24 and ...

MS. NETTER: Why don't we put some language in 1 2. there, something to the effect, "shall make all feasible efforts to ensure that construction is" -basically, something to the effect, "shall try to 5 complete construction within two years but in no event" -- including -- "no event more than three 6 years," and leave the wiggle-room language, "subject to causes beyond the applicant's reasonable control." So they try to do two years, but not longer than three. Does that give you more of a comfort level? 10 11 MR. BOOK: So if they state -- well --12 MS. NETTER: Basically, we'll move it to three 13 years if you don't want them coming back. 14 Do you agree that this is a good thing for the 15 neighborhood, to try to encourage construction to occur 16 as quickly as feasible? That's the first question. 17 MR. BOOK: Yes. Well, with the qualifications, Mr. Hussey also, I think, indicated 18 19 that we don't want to accelerate to the point that it's 20 actually detrimental, so trying to do too much, have 21 them do too much. 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: They're already subject to 23 restrictions on the times of construction. That is 24 already spelled out.

The issue is, in my mind, whether you want to 1 2. try and keep them on a tight time frame to get over the nuisance and impact of the construction period as quickly as possible on the theory that that's the 5 biggest thorn. MR. BOOK: Tight, yes; not unreasonable, 6 though. 8 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Can you define what "unreasonable" is? I can't. 10 MS. NETTER: Do you want to delete the 11 provision? 12 MR. BOOK: No. MR. JESSE GELLER: No, I don't want to. 13 14 MR. NAGLER: One thing we could add is sort of 15 an agreement in advance that any reasonable extension is deemed an insubstantial change. 16 17 MS. NETTER: No. We're not going to, ahead of time, say what is clearly defined --18 19 MR. BOOK: We'll just make it longer.

MR. JESSE GELLER: That's all we're doing.

MR. BOOK: Let's make it longer. Now I think

MR. JESSE GELLER: That's fine.

20

21

22

23

24

about that?

we're sort of throwing darts.

- 1 That's absolutely all we're doing.
- MR. BOOK: We're throwing darts. We're just
- 3 going to make it longer.
- 4 MS. NETTER: So we're going to change the two
- 5 years to thirty months and leave everything as is?
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Hussey?
- 7 MR. HUSSEY: Thirty months?
- 8 MR. BOOK: Two and a half years. Do you think
- 9 it should be three?
- MR. HUSSEY: No. Let's do thirty months.
- 11 They can come back.
- 12 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah. I'm not as bothered
- 13 by the notion that they would have to show up here and
- 14 say, here's what we did. We've used all feasible
- 15 means. We need an extension.
- MR. BOOK: Well, you know, all feasible means,
- 17 you could --
- 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: I don't like the word
- 19 "feasible." I don't even know what that means.
- MR. BOOK: You could double your construction
- 21 costs and get it done in a year.
- MS. NETTER: "All reasonable efforts"?
- MR. HUSSEY: Yes.
- MS. NETTER: Okay.

```
1
               MR. NAGLER: What about "commercially
 2.
      reasonable efforts"?
               MS. NETTER: Do you want "commercially
      reasonable"? "Reasonable"? What's your pleasure?
 5
               MR. BOOK: Make it "commercially reasonable."
               MR. HUSSEY: So what does that leave out?
 6
               MR. NAGLER: We're ditching "feasible."
 8
               MS. NETTER: Okay. Let's move on.
 9
               MR. HUSSEY: 46? That's where we're heading?
10
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
11
               Ms. Morelli, I was noticing in 46 the
      applicant's going to provide plans, but we probably
12
13
      should say to whom.
14
               MS. MORELLI: Yes. This would be Peter Ditto,
15
     director of transportation and engineering.
               MS. NETTER: Any comment on 46? I think
16
17
     that's Mr. Hussey, probably.
18
               MR. JESSE GELLER: So the deletion in (a) is
     because they've identified in the plans --
19
20
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Is there a single
22
      construction entrance or -- there must be multiple
23
      entrances.
24
               MR. HUSSEY: Yeah. That's what I was thinking
```

```
about, 46(e).
 1
 2
               MS. NETTER: Ms. Morelli?
               MS. MORELLI: "Specific locations"? Make it
 3
 4
      plural?
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER:
                                 Yeah.
               MS. NETTER: No. But the question is: Is
 6
      there more than one? You still have to put a plural in
 8
      front of it after "entrances"; right?
               MS. MORELLI: Yes.
               MS. NETTER: So take out the "the" --
10
11
      stabilized construction.
12
               MS. MORELLI: Yes.
13
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Anything else on that?
14
               (No audible response.)
15
               MS. NETTER: Are we up to 47? If we are, I'm
16
      just taking out the word "shall" in front of "emanate,"
17
      so it's "all equipment that emanate sounds." I'm going
18
      to take out that first phrase, so just "applicant shall
19
      keep in optimum working order through regular
20
      maintenance any and all equipment that emanate
21
      sounds."
22
               MR. BOOK: The numbering changed, so we lost a
23
      paragraph.
24
               MS. NETTER: Say it again, please.
```

1 MR. BOOK: There used to be a paragraph 47 2. that was deleted in its entirety, and you changed the number. MS. NETTER: Okay. I didn't know that. I'm 5 surprised it's not showing up here. Oh, you know what, that will show up the next time around. 6 7 Are you concerned that you're missing 8 something you want to have included? 9 MR. BOOK: No. It's just -- so the numbering going forward is now off by one because there was a 10 11 paragraph --12 MR. JESSE GELLER: There was a paragraph about 13 erosion. 14 MS. NETTER: Off by one in terms of what 15 you're looking at? 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yes. The original. 17 MS. NETTER: Yeah. Okay I'm not at that. 18 MR. BOOK: Whereas you intentionally deleted 19 and maintained the numbering, this is an instance where 20 you didn't. 21 MS. NETTER: What I am working off of is this 22 numbering because the cross-referencing starts -- I 23 started to fill in based on these numbers here. 24 MR. BOOK: Okay.

1 MR. HUSSEY: I'm a little confused, though. 2. The earlier edition had quite a different number 47. MS. NETTER: That's what we were just talking about. We deleted it. 5 MR. BOOK: That came out in its entirety. MR. JESSE GELLER: Apparently, Mr. Book is the 6 only one who knows what's going on. 8 MS. MORELLI: It was deleted because the town's general bylaw 8.26 on stormwater covers it, so 9 10 we don't need a condition. 11 MR. HUSSEY: I see. I'd written down here 12 that these would be closed down in case of -- in the affected areas only. There was an implication in the 13 14 original one that the entire project could be closed 15 down due to this runoff. 16 MS. MORELLI: 8.26 covers enforcement. 17 MR. HUSSEY: In the town bylaw? 18 MS. MORELLI: Yes. The general bylaw. 19 MS. NETTER: So after we complete the whole 20 decision, you will get a compare docs from what you had 21 December 15th. 22 MR. BOOK: Okay. Great. You'll do a 23 cumulative red line? 24 MS. NETTER: Correct.

```
MR. BOOK: Great. 48?
 1
 2
               MR. HUSSEY: Hasn't that already been
 3
      covered?
               MS. NETTER: I'm sorry?
 5
               MR. HUSSEY: 48, wasn't that already covered
      in a previous monthly report?
 6
 7
               MS. NETTER: Yeah. I think the other
 8
      monthly -- was that insects? Or what was the other
 9
      monthly plan?
10
               MR. HUSSEY: It has to do with water, sewer,
11
      and stormwater systems.
12
               MS. NETTER: Okay. Not insects.
              MR. HUSSEY: So this is different?
13
14
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
1.5
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Is there something in here
16
      about reports to the building inspector?
17
               MS. NETTER: I'm sorry. Which is the "here"
18
      you're referring to?
19
               MR. HUSSEY: "During construction the
20
      applicant shall provide the director of transportation
21
      and engineering with a monthly report outlining the
      status of the project." I'm sort of curious if the
22
23
      building inspector --
24
               MS. NETTER: We can include building
```

- 1 inspector. Generally, we were just including one
- official. Oh, here we've got two on 51. Yeah, we can
- 3 say building inspector. The thought is there would be
- 4 one person in town and they would circulate it, but
- 5 it's all fine.
- 6 MR. HUSSEY: Mr. Bennett, doesn't the building
- 7 code require periodic reports to you?
- 8 MR. BENNETT: Yes. That's for the
- 9 construction of the buildings.
- 10 MR. HUSSEY: Right.
- 11 MR. BENNETT: I think this is associated with
- some of the infrastructure related to site work, but
- 13 either one --
- MS. NETTER: Actually, it just says during
- 15 construction there's a monthly report.
- 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: That's actually the issue.
- 17 The issue is that --
- MS. NETTER: What is it on.
- 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right.
- MS. NETTER: It's just the state of the
- 21 project. It's everything.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Well, if it's globally the
- 23 project, then I think it would be the building
- inspector. If it's specific to things that touch upon

- 1 the engineering --
- MS. NETTER: Yeah. Let me go back to the
- 3 other one because I think 40 is water, sewer, and
- 4 stormwater systems, and there's director of
- 5 transportation and engineering.
- So do you want to check with Mr. Ditto, or do
- 7 you have some thoughts on this, Ms. Morelli, 40 versus
- 8 48?
- 9 MS. MORELLI: I would have to talk to Peter.
- 10 MS. NETTER: Okay. And maybe also
- 11 Mr. Bennett.
- 12 MR. HUSSEY: I would add the building
- 13 commissioner in this as well.
- MS. NETTER: Yes. We'll check also with town
- 15 officials.
- 16 We're on 49?
- 17 MR. HUSSEY: That looks fine. It's just that
- we're spread out all over the place.
- 19 MS. NETTER: We're jumping around, yes.
- 20 MR. HUSSEY: But that's okay. So probably one
- 21 sign. We don't want to say where it is but leave it up
- 22 to the developer. Yeah, okay.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: 50?
- MR. BOOK: I have no comment.

```
1
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Hussey?
 2
               MR. HUSSEY: On 50 or 51?
 3
               MS. NETTER: 50.
 4
               MR. HUSSEY: 50, all set.
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 51?
               MR. BOOK: I do not have a comment.
 6
 7
               MS. NETTER: I just have a question.
 8
      we look at the attachment right now, or should we wait
 9
      until later, or should I just assume you've already
10
      looked? This is the blasting.
11
               MR. HUSSEY: Basically, the consultant's memo;
12
     right?
13
               MS. NETTER: Correct. With some small
14
      revisions.
15
               MR. HUSSEY: I'm sure it's fine.
               MS. NETTER: It's numbered 24, but it's got
16
17
      waivers before it.
18
               MS. MORELLI: Attachment 1 is the waivers.
19
      The appendix is the blasting.
20
               MS. NETTER: The consultant's report, I've
21
     reviewed this, town staff has reviewed it, including
22
     the fire chief.
23
               MR. HUSSEY: So onto 52?
24
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
```

```
1
               MR. BOOK: I think 51 is fine as is.
 2
               MS. NETTER: Are we good with 52?
               MR. HUSSEY: Yeah.
 3
               MS. NETTER: How about 53?
 5
               MR. HUSSEY: Yup. Well, no. I'm sorry. 53.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: I think we have to
 6
      specify -- the notion is that there are multiple COs,
      and therefore when you say, "prior to the issuance of
      the CO" -- for a specific structure.
10
               MS. NETTER: Let me talk to Mr. Bennett
11
     because he absolutely -- this was originally --
12
     Mr. Bennett, can we look at number 53? See, I think
13
      the applicant also -- I think he wanted something
14
      different here, so let's see.
15
               MR. BENNETT: What's the question?
16
               MS. NETTER: Why don't you say what the
17
      language is that you want to put in here.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: So my -- again, this goes
18
19
      to the issue of there being multiple COs for multiple
20
     buildings. So when you refer to prior -- or when this
21
     refers to "prior to the issuance of a CO for" -- not
22
     the project, but a specific structure. That's what
23
     you're really referring to; correct?
24
               MR. BENNETT: Yes.
```

1 MR. JESSE GELLER: There's not going to be a 2. project-wide CO? MR. BENNETT: No. It will be -- in this instance, most likely they'll be building by building. 5 And depending upon how they occupy the structures, whether it's the four-unit, an eight-unit, or the 6 midrise, we would sometimes issue temporaries for each unit and then there's a CO for the whole building. MS. NETTER: Oh, okay. So prior to the issuance -- instead of "of the CO," do we want to say 10 11 "of each CO" or -- you want an as-built per unit or per 12 building? 13 MR. BENNETT: No. We need an as-built for the 14 location of the building on the site so then we can 15 compare that it was built in accordance with the plans. 16 MS. NETTER: So you want -- prior to the 17 issuance of each CO for each building, you want the 18 as-built plan for that building? 19 MR. BENNETT: We want to know the location of 20 that building. So what will happen is as they 21 construct -- I'm not going to get the building numbers 22 right -- they construct building -- we give permits to 23 Buildings 1 through 5 and they construct Building 24 Number 1 and start requesting occupancies in Building

- 1 Number 1, we'll need the as-built for Building
- 2 Number 1. Then they can go down the line and do
- 3 Building Number 2, Building Number 3.
- 4 If they ask for all of them at the same time,
- 5 we'd get an as-built of each one and then they'd keep
- 6 submitting an as-built plan to get rid of the first
- 7 ones and the as-builts would show up progressively as
- 8 the project is constructed.
- 9 MS. NETTER: Can I -- do you want to take a
- 10 crack? I mean, I thought I understood what he was
- 11 saying, but then I --
- MR. BENNETT: It's actually going to be two
- different types of certificates, as-builts.
- MS. NETTER: That's what I'm trying to
- 15 understand.
- 16 MR. BENNETT: So I'm going to want to know
- where the location of the buildings are so that I can
- then compare that to the approved plans.
- 19 MS. NETTER: So the first step is, for each CO
- 20 you're going to want to see -- for each CO -- for each
- 21 building you're going to want to see an as-built for
- 22 the location --
- MR. BENNETT: Yes.
- MS. NETTER: -- of the buildings?

1 MR. BENNETT: Correct. As it gets constructed 2. and more of the utilities and the sewer and the water -- that's the DPW. They're going to want as-builts as well. Those would come at different 5 times. In addition, we're going to want to look at 6 parking layout in the driveways and make sure those 8 comply and conform. So it is going to be a little 9 tricky how we word this, but I'm looking for different 10 as-builts than what the Department of Public Works is 11 looking for. 12 MS. NETTER: Is this in writing anyplace? 13 MR. BENNETT: Well, mine is a standard thing, 14 yes. On my building permit there's an as-built for the 15 foundation. 16 MS. NETTER: And does Mr. Ditto have something 17 in writing? 18 MR. BENNETT: I believe he does. I'm not 100 19 percent --20 MS. NETTER: So I think we have to do a little 21 bit more work on this, do you think? 22 MS. MORELLI: Okay. 23 MR. HUSSEY: I think it's implicit in the 24 process already in place. I think the general

statement you've got here is fine. 1 2 MS. NETTER: Oh, it is? MR. HUSSEY: I think so. I mean, I'd take out "each phase." Let's say, "for each building." "Prior 5 to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each building," and then leave the rest as it is. Do you 6 think, Mr. Bennett, or --MR. BENNETT: The only struggle there might be is for the applicant to get a final as-built for the 9 10 DPW, which is going to locate all the water shut-offs, 11 all manholes, all of that in one of these sentences 12 here. That might be difficult as the project is 13 ongoing. 14 Definitely at the end of the project we need 15 one final as-built that's going to be identified on the 16 whole plan that would show all the utilities, all the 17 parking, edge of pavement, building locations. So I think that the challenge is going to be how we get 18 these documents as the project is in process, so from 19 20 start to finish. No doubt, at the end there will be a 21 final PDF format, digital and submitted. 22 MS. NETTER: Within how many days of final 23 issuance of CO, the final as-built --24 MR. BENNETT: Well, I get my as-builts before

1 I issue the CO. 2 MR. HUSSEY: So that part of it is written 3 properly. MR. BENNETT: That's the foundation. Peter --I'd have to sit and talk with Peter to find out --5 MS. NETTER: Okay. So we need to do a little 6 bit more work because really there's kind of two --8 MR. BENNETT: There's two processes going forward. We do get a sign-off from the Engineering 9 Department before we issue a CO. I would just have to 10 11 find out from Peter what they're looking at. I don't 12 know their checklist or what it is they're looking at. 13 There's a spot on the form that --14 MS. NETTER: So I guess the question is, 15 really, what is not already in place? In other words, 16 if Mr. Ditto has his checklist that the applicant has 17 to comply with regardless, what do we have to supplement in the decision that's not already part of 18 19 the standard operating procedure of the town, is really 20 the question. 21 MR. BENNETT: We can have a conversation and 22 then come back with some better language. 23 MS. NETTER: Great. That's terrific. 24 I know, Mr. Hussey, you like 55, or whether

```
that was Mr. Book, I forget which.
 1
 2
               MR. HUSSEY: That wasn't me.
 3
               MS. NETTER: Okay.
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. So 54 is okay. No.
 5
     That's okay.
              MS. NETTER: What's okay?
 6
              MR. HUSSEY: Deleting 55.
              MR. JESSE GELLER: That was Mr. Book's issue.
 9
               MR. BOOK: To delete it?
10
               MS. NETTER: It's only deleted because it's
11
      said elsewhere.
12
              MR. JESSE GELLER: 56?
13
              MR. HUSSEY: No comment.
14
               MR. BOOK: Do you need a building permit to --
15
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Grub? A grubbing permit?
      To quote Mr. Bennett, you need a permit for anything in
16
17
     the Town of Brookline.
18
               So I take it no comments on 56?
19
               MR. HUSSEY: No.
20
              MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. 57?
21
              MR. HUSSEY: No.
22
              MR. JESSE GELLER: 58?
23
              MR. HUSSEY: That's deleted.
24
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 59? 60? 61?
```

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: Let me read this a little
 2
      tighter.
 3
               MS. NETTER: What are you reading tighter?
               MR. HUSSEY: 62. How is future litigation
 4
      affected?
 5
               MS. NETTER: There's an exception for
 6
 7
      litigation.
                   It's not a --
 8
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. So it's covered, in other
 9
      words, in the law someplace?
10
               MS. NETTER: Yes.
11
               MR. NAGLER: The regulation says, "The time
12
      period shall be told for the time required to pursue or
      wait the determination of an appeal, " et cetera, et
13
14
      cetera.
               MR. BOOK: So the decision wouldn't be final
1.5
16
      if it was appealed?
17
               MR. NAGLER: Right.
18
               MR. BOOK: 63 needs to be indented.
19
               MS. NETTER: Yes. And there needs to be a
20
      space after 64.
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: 64? 65?
               I thought it was 27.8, but --
22
23
               MS. NETTER:
                            It was. I rounded it off and I
24
      added all the numbers adjusted for inflation.
```

```
1
               MR. HUSSEY: I'm on 67. Does that cover the
 2
      cost of fire watch and police details necessary for the
     blasting?
              MS. NETTER: I think that's the intention of
 5
      this, yes. Do you want me to reference --
              MR. HUSSEY: No. It's global, isn't it?
 6
              MS. NETTER: Let me ask Ms. Morelli.
               Is this the blasting or is this the --
               MS. MORELLI: So you need police details for
     more than just the blasting, so it includes blasting
10
11
     and any other details we need.
12
               MS. NETTER: Okay. But it's town standard
13
     practices?
14
              MS. STEINFELD: Yup.
15
               MR. HUSSEY: I just want to make sure the
     blasting is included here. So does the town require
16
17
      fire watch on all blasting projects?
18
               MS. MORELLI: Yes, it does.
19
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. All set.
                                            Thanks.
20
              All right. We're down to rubbish.
21
              MR. BOOK: Are we on 70?
22
              MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Hussey, do you have any
23
      comments on 69, rubbish?
24
               MR. HUSSEY: No, I certainly don't.
```

```
1
               MR. BOOK: I don't have any comments on
 2
      rubbish.
 3
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Then, yes, we are on 70.
               MR. BOOK: Do we need 70?
 5
               MR. NAGLER: You can blame me for that one.
               MR. BOOK: Okay.
 6
               MR. NAGLER: Probably not. But it's -- I
      guess it's a statement of the law. Without a PEL,
 8
 9
      there's not a comprehensive permit. It's just a
      jurisdictional requirement of the comprehensive
10
11
      permit.
12
               It was when I had -- initially I had discussed
13
      a proposed condition that the attorney for some of the
14
      abutters had requested that said absolutely that there
15
      could be no construction while the appeal was pending.
16
      And I felt like that's encroaching too much on the
17
      subsidizing agency's powers, even though there's this
18
      little catch-22 where the judge apparently on the
      appeal in the ongoing litigation didn't find an avenue
19
20
      in that litigation to review the PEL. So the question
21
      is where, how, under what procedures it's all
2.2
      reviewed.
23
               But I had to look at the regulations
24
      themselves, which seem to defer to the subsidizing
```

agency, so this was somewhat of a middle ground, I 1 2. guess, as opposed to just being totally silent. 3 MR. JESSE GELLER: So there are two pieces to this, it seems to me. The first is, there's no 5 independent authority of this board. It hinges on the PEL and the PEL standing up; right? 6 7 MR. NAGLER: Yes. MR. JESSE GELLER: Regardless -- whatever we 8 9 do. 10 The second component is cleaning up the site 11 if they decide to move forward. And there's nothing --12 do we have existing ordinances that would otherwise 13 cover that? 14 MS. NETTER: No. That's the new language. 1.5 MR. NAGLER: Right. MR. JESSE GELLER: So that specific -- there's 16 17 no redundancy with that piece. 18 MR. BOOK: So the building commissioner is 19 obligated -- is required to give the building permit 20 while an appeal is pending? 21 MS. NETTER: There's nothing to preclude it. 22 MR. NAGLER: Right. Because this is not an 23 appeal of the comprehensive permit. This is an appeal 24 of the --

1 MR. BOOK: This is an appeal of the PEL. 2 MR. NAGLER: Right. So right now the current status of the PEL is upheld by the law. MR. JESSE GELLER: I have to say, I much 5 prefer the rephrasing of this, if you would. I didn't like how it was stated before. This is better worded, 6 in my opinion. If you feel compelled to put this into the decision, it seems to me this is far better. MS. NETTER: It's more reasonable. MR. NAGLER: And then I would imagine if the 10 11 PEL were struck down, the logical remedy would be to 12 restore anyway, but this makes --13 MR. JESSE GELLER: I would think so, but ... MR. BOOK: Okay. 14 MR. JESSE GELLER: Worded in this fashion, I 15 16 don't object. 17 MR. BOOK: Yeah. No. I didn't object to it. 18 I just was questioning whether we needed it. 19 MR. NAGLER: In the larger scheme of things, 20 probably not in the sense that the applicant has 21 advised that they didn't commit to it. But they 22 advised the board that they don't intend to commit to

the structure anyway. So if they don't, it's moot.

But just in case they did, in case the appeal were

23

24

- 1 upheld, there's some kind of a process.
- 2 MR. BOOK: All right.
- 3 MR. JESSE GELLER: In terms of -- I want to
- 4 return to something I said when we first started this.
- 5 And I think I owe Edie a dollar because you said we
- 6 were actually going to get through this.
- 7 MS. NETTER: Oh, I knew you were. You don't
- 8 have to pay up. I knew it. Because you went through
- 9 much of the hard --
- 10 MR. JESSE GELLER: So the question becomes,
- 11 outside of the 70 conditions that we have here and the
- 12 findings, is there anything else?
- MS. NETTER: And also the waivers.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: But so you sort of touched
- on it because you said, should I ask the questions now
- or wait until later. I think to the extent that any of
- 17 those are sort of outside this box, now is the time.
- 18 MR. HUSSEY: Well, the other thing that I had
- 19 a question about is, you've got a lot of requests from
- 20 neighbors about putting things in the conditions and
- 21 what have you. These are summarized in the documents
- 22 that the planning staff has given us, but I don't think
- 23 we've addressed that document specifically as to which
- items should be in and which should be ignored. Are we

```
going to do that at some point?
 1
                            It's completely up to you.
 2
               MS. NETTER:
 3
               MR. HUSSEY: I think we should.
               MR. JESSE GELLER: I agree with you.
 5
               MR. HUSSEY: Not tonight, but --
               MR. JESSE GELLER: I agree with you. So we're
 6
      next up on the 2nd?
 8
               No, no. I'm not stopping. I'm simply
 9
      commenting on Mr. Hussey's --
10
               MS. NETTER: Next Monday.
11
               MR. JESSE GELLER: So let's take time on the
12
      2nd, next Monday, to do that. Okay?
13
               MR. HUSSEY: Yup. Sounds good.
14
               I'm sort of curious as to this PEL letter.
15
      don't think we've ever -- I've never seen that. Is
16
      that an issue --
17
               MS. NETTER: Oh, we certainly have. It's part
18
     of the application.
19
               MR. BOOK: It's the first thing we got a
20
     year -- way back.
21
               MS. NETTER: I'm sure we can provide it to
22
      you.
23
               MR. HUSSEY: No. That's all right.
24
               We talked about the neighborhood, town boards,
```

- 1 already done.
- I was wondering about adding in the findings,
- 3 something regarding the density studies that we did as
- 4 information that's been generated. I think they can be
- 5 worked into the opinion.
- 6 MS. NETTER: You have to help me out because I
- don't know what you do in a special permit context and
- 8 I've never heard of that opinion clause.
- 9 MR. JESSE GELLER: So forgetting that specific
- 10 reference, in a decision that is written on a 40A
- 11 matter, the decision would include some of the
- 12 reasoning for the decision.
- 13 MS. NETTER: But that would be findings. That
- 14 reasoning normally -- I don't know what you call it,
- 15 but those are findings.
- 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. And in this case, I
- 17 think Mr. Hussey is speaking to those kinds of findings
- 18 that you would include.
- 19 MS. NETTER: Yes. And we have some findings,
- 20 but you would like to add others?
- 21 MR. NAGLER: The difference is, for a special
- 22 permit variance by statute, it says you must find the
- 23 following five things: Number 1, like, for a variance
- 24 there's a hardship. Here's why --

1 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. But it's also, for instance, in the special permit context where a mere 2. recitation of the five standards is insufficient. MR. NAGLER: Correct. Here there's only 5 really one standard, consistency with local needs. It's not -- it doesn't say you must find A, B, C, D, 6 and E the way they do in a special permit. That's why all of this really goes to that. MR. JESSE GELLER: No. But Mr. Hussey raises 10 a good point because, you know, there has been a year of vested interest in this -- I'm not referring to us 11 obviously -- and there's a certain logic that, you 12 13 know, we've internally sort of thought through and sort 14 of reflected in many of our comments, but it's not 15 reflected in the decision. The decision ultimately, as 16 drafted, has become sort of this technical document. 17 So the question is whether there should be -- and I 18 hate to use the word -- but the explanation. MS. NETTER: Well, let me reframe it a little 19 20 bit because you're not in a special permit context. 21 And as Attorney Nagler said, you are dealing within the 22 framework of consistency with local needs. In other 23 words, balancing the need for affordable housing with 24 the local -- the legitimate local concerns.

1 And so to the extent -- and I had anticipated 2 you would work some more on the findings to reflect your own thinking, but you want to go a little bit away from how you write your special permits and more in 5 terms of "we find that," or -- so we've got to frame this to make sure it fits within the law is all I'm suggesting to you. But it gets to, I think, where you want to go, which is what is your thinking about the project; right? MR. HUSSEY: I think it probably doesn't get 10 quite as far as I want to go, but it gets, to some 11 extent, the local needs. I went through a lot of the 12 information that we've got where the local needs are 13 14 stated, but what is not stated is the list of local 15 needs that would be considered. MS. NETTER: May I ask what your -- give some 16 17 ideas. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Well, one of them is the density studies showing that the density of parts of this 19 20 project are somewhat more than the density of the 21 immediate neighborhood. That's one thing that seems to 22 be ... 23 The number of neighbors that have spoken and 24 the number of times they've spoken, the sense of

- 1 territoriality that they have, the protection of their
- 2 territory in a sense. I mean, there are some very soft
- 3 issues that go into all of this that, I guess, just are
- 4 never touched on as a rule.
- I mean, for instance, one of the comments that
- one of the neighbors made, they're trying to certify
- 7 the neighborhood, which goes back to the density
- 8 issues, which I think is a valid observation. This
- 9 is -- the big building in particular, the apartment
- 10 building, is an urban solution. It's not a suburban
- 11 solution; it's an urban solution.
- So it's getting into all of those issues and
- 13 talking about them and explaining how they fold into
- our decision. I mean, that's what I'm talking about.
- 15 It's really an open-ended discussion. And it may
- 16 inform people going forward. It may inform the courts
- 17 going forward. I don't -- we may not want to inform
- 18 the courts going forward.
- 19 MS. NETTER: Well, the decision itself is not
- 20 typically part -- well, I don't even want to go there.
- 21 Let's --
- 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah. I actually thought
- 23 your comment was on more -- forgive me for using the
- 24 phrase "more concrete" -- of pieces of information, you

- 1 know, whether it was pertaining to traffic or whether
- 2 it was pertaining to drainage and the reliance on
- 3 testimony provided at the hearings. In other words,
- 4 that's the basis for the reasoning.
- 5 You're really speaking to things that I think
- 6 are broader, more amorphous. Okay? I think that's
- 7 extremely difficult to express in a decision, and I
- 8 don't think you're ever going to adequately be able to
- 9 do that.
- 10 So if your comment is, well, within the
- findings you want to acknowledge that we've had peer
- 12 review on transportation, and while we recognize the
- 13 potential for increased traffic, ultimately our
- 14 determination was X. Okay? So that, I understand.
- 15 I'd be concerned about trying to sort of
- 16 adequately address those broader topics because I don't
- think we would do it well, and I don't know that we
- 18 would be able to do it at all.
- 19 MR. HUSSEY: Well, am I wrong in stating that
- 20 in certain decisions that are rendered by judges both
- 21 at the local and state and national levels that there
- 22 are opinions voiced as part of those decisions that
- touch on these soft issues, or not?
- MR. JESSE GELLER: There may well be, but

we're not judges. We're just ZBA members on a 40B 1 2 case. MR. HUSSEY: And all that requires is to say we approve or we don't approve. You know, we approve 5 this condition. That's all we need to say, I mean, is 6 what you're saying. MS. NETTER: Yeah. But what's really critical -- I mean, certainly you might want to look through the findings and say, you know, for traffic 10 this is what we find. It may be completely based on 11 what the consultant said, or you may weigh the evidence 12 and say something else. That's up to you. But what's most critical in terms of really 13 14 having an impact is asking yourself, if you can approve 15 this project, do you have all the conditions that are 16 necessary? I mean, we have -- I'll tell you, Maria's 17 done a lot of this, and other staff, but I've also done 18 a fair amount, as has Sam and Kathy, but, you know, reread all the studies -- I didn't reread the 19 20 transcript. Maria has -- reread all my notes. But to 21 the extent you may have other conditions that we 22 haven't touched on, that's really --23 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. And do those

conditions address the concerns you're raising?

24

Page 107

MR. HUSSEY: All right. Let me reflect on 1 2. it. MR. JESSE GELLER: I like where you're going with it. I think it has to be more limited and finite. 5 MR. HUSSEY: Refined. All right. I'm going to reflect on this initial discussion. 6 7 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So -- but we can 8 raise it again on Monday. I'd like to sort of have a sense of what we want to do with that. 10 The other thing I know that you were going to 11 raise was the topic of -- you wanted to talk about 12 waivers? MS. NETTER: I would like to have covered 13 14 everything so we can come back to you on Monday if 15 possible -- you know, as soon as we can -- with a 16 document that shows you where we started and where we 17 are and we can look at it as a whole. 18 MR. HUSSEY: I don't think I have any 19 questions on waivers. MR. JESSE GELLER: And this is -- I don't have 20 21 the one that -- the most recent iteration that I had 22 marked up, but this reflects the most recent version in 23 which we had made changes.

MS. MORELLI: The most recent version of the

24

- 1 waivers is dated January 9, 2015, and you have that
- 2 included in your January 28th draft.
- 3 MS. NETTER: But his question was: Does this
- 4 reflect all the questions asked and changes requested?
- 5 MS. MORELLI: Absolutely.
- 6 MR. HUSSEY: So this is the January 9th list,
- 7 basically, which is part of this document.
- 8 MS. MORELLI: Yes.
- 9 MS. NETTER: Everything is included here that
- 10 we would propose would be ...
- 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: There was a question --
- 12 Mark's not here, but Mark raised that question about
- 13 condensers located within the setbacks.
- 14 MS. NETTER: That's in the revised conditions;
- 15 right?
- MS. MORELLI: Yes, it is.
- 17 MR. HUSSEY: That's here in the conditions?
- MS. NETTER: Yes.
- 19 MR. JESSE GELLER: No. That was waivers.
- They were asking for a waiver for locating condensers
- 21 within the setbacks.
- 22 MS. NETTER: But there's a clarified
- 23 condition. It's a condition.
- MS. MORELLI: There is a condition -- I'll

- have to find it for you -- that there are no --1 2 MS. NETTER: And I can't remember if we needed a revised waiver for that, Ms. Morelli. MR. HUSSEY: We don't need a waiver, do we? 5 MS. NETTER: It's Condition 13. MR. BOOK: I think Mr. Bennett had said that 6 you're allowed to -- you can put condensers in the 8 setback. MR. HUSSEY: Yeah. It's an accessory piece of 10 equipment, so it can be. 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: So it can be. Okav. 12 MS. MORELLI: Air conditioning condensers may 13 be installed and maintained within six feet of any 14 building, and that's per regulation. 1.5 MR. BENNETT: So in one of those conditions, I had recommended that we not allow anything within that 16 17 20-foot setback. The applicant then proposed to put condensers within six feet of the building. 18
- application of this, where could a condenser unit go?

  It's considered an accessory structure, and it can be

I was asked the question, in a normal

- 22 within six feet of a lot line.
- 23 So what this condition does is it allows a
- 24 condenser unit in the rear of the building within six

19

feet, thereby reducing that setback to Beverly and 1 2 Russett Road in some instances to 14 feet. 3 MR. HUSSEY: That shouldn't be a problem, 4 because you've got a solid fence. 5 MR. JESSE GELLER: Yeah. I remember that. But it was a question that Mr. Zuroff had asked, and I 6 just wanted to make sure ... 8 MS. NETTER: I think we're good. MR. JESSE GELLER: Is there anything else? MS. NETTER: So are we good on waivers? Is 10 11 that what you're saying? 12 MR. BOOK: I think so. 13 MS. NETTER: Anything to highlight with 14 waivers to the board's attention, or ... 1.5 MS. MORELLI: No. The applicant, in the 16 January 12th hearing, highlighted additional waivers 17 that they needed in their presentation to you. 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. Okay. 19 MR. NAGLER: I'm sorry. So that means there

MS. NETTER: I recommend that you read at your

they explained what conditions they made to that.

MS. MORELLI: No. The January 9th waivers,

leisure -- when you reread the decision, you'll see a

20

21

22

will be a revised --

- 1 condition, either 11 or 10. When you read the housing
- 2 conditions, you want to read the attachment terms to be
- 3 included. I'm jumping ahead.
- 4 MR. BOOK: Right.
- 5 MR. JESSE GELLER: Oh, you're referring to
- 6 in -- okay.
- 7 MS. NETTER: You think I understood what you
- 8 said?
- 9 MR. JESSE GELLER: No, I don't. But I didn't
- 10 understand what you said, so it's fair.
- MR. HUSSEY: So next Monday we're going to be
- 12 talking about the neighborhood-expressed interest in
- 13 conditions, and we're going to be discussing some of my
- 14 issues.
- 15 MR. BOOK: Chris, you mentioned -- and maybe I
- 16 misunderstood. I have a number of emails and memos
- from neighbors with proposed conditions. Did you say
- 18 that the Planning Board had summarized them?
- 19 MS. NETTER: Yes. There's a chart.
- MR. HUSSEY: She's got quite a good chart.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Maria, would you
- 22 recirculate that? I actually don't remember seeing
- that either.
- MS. NETTER: Oh. You were referring to it.

1 MR. JESSE GELLER: No. I referred to it after 2 he spoke to it. MS. STEINFELD: We'll resend it. MR. HUSSEY: It's quite good, by the way. 5 MR. BOOK: Edie, you're going to make revisions to the decision for next Monday? Is that --6 okay. MS. NETTER: Yes. And we will give you something that shows the changes -- as best we can --9 10 the changes from December 5th, the original version, 11 through today. MR. BOOK: Okay. May I ask -- Maria, would it 12 13 be possible to circulate a clean version of the 14 decision as it currently stands so -- it would just be 15 easier to do a readthrough over the weekend. MS. NETTER: When you say, a clean version as 16 17 it currently stands, you mean not through today? 18 MR. BOOK: Well, no. 19 MS. NETTER: Let me just say --20 MR. BOOK: Unless you're going to be able to 21 incorporate what we've discussed by --22 MS. NETTER: Not before the weekend. 23 MR. BOOK: Okay. 24 The problem is that some of the MS. NETTER:

things they'd already reviewed, then there are also 1 2 more changes that they haven't had a chance to see. So if we show you a clean version of what already is, you may be looking and saying, oh, I haven't seen that before. 5 Do you know what I'm saying? MR. BOOK: Well, I guess what I'm saying, 6 wouldn't this be the version that we -- this is really the most current thing that we have, is this. And if I could see it without red lining --10 MS. NETTER: Got it. And without today's 11 changes. 12 MR. BOOK: Yes. 13 MS. NETTER: Okay. 14 MS. MORELLI: So it's the January 28th draft, 15 clean? MR. BOOK: The January 28th draft, clean. 16 17 That's today; right? 18 MS. NETTER: Yes. 19 MR. HUSSEY: You've done a good job, I think, 20 because this can get chaotic. 21 MS. NETTER: I've never seen something as --22 MR. JESSE GELLER: -- workable as this? 23 MS. NETTER: Right. And ultimately I think 24 will be very workable.

- 1 MR. HUSSEY: It either means we're doing a 2 tremendous job, or we're doing a lousy job.
- 3 MR. JESSE GELLER: We'll leave it to others to
- 4 determine.
- 5 MR. HUSSEY: Exactly.
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. Anything else for
- 7 tonight?
- 8 MS. NETTER: I'm thrilled that we've gotten to
- 9 where we had hoped.
- MR. BOOK: So we have two more?
- MR. JESSE GELLER: We have the 2nd and we have
- 12 the 4th.
- 13 MS. NETTER: Yeah. So if we can really --
- 14 what I would like to accomplish on Monday is your
- discussion and looking at everything, so the changes
- that we made to the earlier sections that you reviewed,
- 17 the new changes that you haven't seen, and tonight, and
- 18 talk about if there are any new conditions as well as
- 19 your discussions.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Well, let me correct you.
- 21 I think there are two discrete items that Mr. Hussey
- 22 has raised for discussion. I think they're both
- 23 important.
- MS. NETTER: Right. So what I would -- I

don't know if it's possible, but what I would -- I 1 2 mean, maybe everything can be done by 10:00, but I would like to request of you that we do all of that. So even if it means -- this is the question -- that we 5 have to stay an hour longer, maybe we do that. MR. JESSE GELLER: An hour longer than what? 6 MS. NETTER: Than 10:00. 8 MR. HUSSEY: Next Monday. We ought to be able to wrap it up by 10:00. I think the more complicated 9 10 issue is -- the next meeting is Wednesday? 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: The one after Monday is 12 Wednesday. 13 MR. HUSSEY: But after Monday, then I think 14 we'd be free -- or you'd be free to do a final -- list 15 of final considerations -- conditions rather. 16 MS. NETTER: Yes. That's the idea. 17 MR. HUSSEY: And we need to get that some days 18 before we meet. 19 MS. NETTER: Can't. We won't be able to do 20 it, because your meeting is on Wednesday. 21 MR. BOOK: Two days later. 22 MR. HUSSEY: No. I understand that. I'm 23 saying that that's not enough time to make it work.

MS. NETTER: The goal is Monday and Wednesday

24

and that would be it. 1 2 MR. HUSSEY: No. I understand that. But can we really get that information all together and --3 MS. NETTER: We have no choice. 4 5 MR. HUSSEY: We have no choice. When does this whole thing run out? 6 7 MR. JESSE GELLER: The 23rd. MR. HUSSEY: The 23rd. That's what I 8 9 thought. 10 MR. JESSE GELLER: But you lose two of us 11 on --12 When are you leaving? The 16th? 13 MR. BOOK: The 13th. 14 MS. NETTER: And you lose me, which is 15 absolutely fine, but just to let you know, I'm here through Wednesday. 16 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: So you and Sam will have a 18 very lonely time. 19 MS. NETTER: Let's see where we go, but I do 20 think we're very close. 21 MR. HUSSEY: All right. 22 MS. NETTER: And to the extent you have 23 particular -- whether you want to call it findings or 24 opinions -- really tightened, you know, that will move

```
things along.
 1
               MR. HUSSEY: Then I should have them written
 2
      up for next Monday.
               MS. NETTER: If that's possible.
               MS. STEINFELD: And if you want to send them
 5
      to the planning department, we'll be happy to
 6
      distribute them prior to Monday night.
               MR. HUSSEY: Yup.
 9
               MS. NETTER: It's taken me a year to learn not
10
     to volunteer you guys.
11
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Anything else?
12
               MS. NETTER: No. I think this is terrific.
13
               MR. JESSE GELLER: So our next meeting is
14
      February 2nd at 7:00 p.m. Thank you, everyone.
15
               (Proceedings suspended at 10:01 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and
 1
 2
      Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
      Massachusetts, certify:
               That the foregoing proceedings were taken
      before me at the time and place therein set forth and
 5
      that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
 6
      my shorthand notes so taken.
               I further certify that I am not a relative or
 9
      employee of any of the parties, nor am I financially
10
      interested in the action.
11
               I declare under penalty of perjury that the
12
      foregoing is true and correct.
13
               Dated this 9th day of February, 2015.
14
      Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public
15
      My commission expires November 3, 2017.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

			Ī
A	addition	15:20 33:5 35:1 75:17	anybody
able	12:22 15:6 42:2 73:3	76:14 100:4,6	4:6 13:15 33:7
65:9 73:24 105:8,18	73:18 90:6	agreeing	anyplace
112:20 115:8,19	additional	46:21 49:12	90:12
absence	10:15,17 13:13 110:16	agreement	anyway
10:5	address	77:15	57:6 98:12,23
absolutely	105:16 106:24	ahead	apartment
71:13 78:1 87:11	addressed	77:17 111:3	24:12 46:4 75:10,11
96:14 108:5 116:15	11:21 99:23	Air	104:9
absorbed	adequacy	109:12	apparently
34:16	49:23	alarm	82:6 96:18
abutters	adequate	47:1	appeal
22:14 96:14	19:21 51:4 52:3 70:2	Allison	94:13 96:15,19 97:20
abutting	adequately	2:7	97:23,23 98:1,24
16:8	105:8,16	allotment	appealed
accelerate	adjusted	69:24 70:2	94:16
76:19	94:24	allow	Appeals
accept	administration	109:16	1:5
54:10	34:15	allowed	Appearances
acceptable	administrative	74:23 109:7	2:1
19:2 50:12 52:22	6:24 7:5	allows	appears
57:16,18	advance	109:23	24:20
access	77:15	alter	appendix
11:16 39:8,18 40:22	advancing	63:19	86:19
accessory	29:2	alternative	applicable
109:9,21	advantage	20:13 36:24	21:24 23:9 52:20
accomplish	75:22	alternatives	applicant
68:20 70:4,4 114:14	adverse	18:21	20:12 25:18 26:2
acknowledge	32:19,22 34:3,4,4,18	altogether	29:20 30:9 39:20
105:11	34:20 35:4,11,15	61:15	42:23 47:18 51:21
acknowledging	advised	amend	52:1 54:7 56:1 57:24
5:6	98:21,22	48:12	60:2 64:16,24 65:17
acquiescence	advises	amended	67:24 70:9,23 71:2
54:18	17:9	48:20	72:4 80:18 83:20
action	affect	amendment	87:13 91:9 92:16
118:10	15:15	65:6	98:20 109:17 110:15
actual	affordable	amorphous	applicant's
24:5	102:23	105:6	18:16 52:15 57:22
add	agency	amount	64:22 66:2 76:8
8:12 20:8 77:14 85:12	97:1	73:1 75:12 106:18	79:12
101:20	agency's	answer	application
added	96:17	6:20	1:7 45:3,4,22,24 50:18
94:24	ago	anticipated	50:19,20,21 53:6,7,9
adding	29:17	64:18 65:2 71:12	100:18 109:20
101:2	agree	103:1	applications
L			

46:10	108:20	12:9 14:11 15:12	12:23
applied	associated	18:12 22:7 24:2	belts
34:13	84:11	31:12 34:17 39:5	26:5
applies	Associates	55:8 56:10 57:7	Bennett
21:3,4	2:11	63:11,20 64:19 65:5	2:12 44:4,11,16,24
		66:4 67:14,18,20	45:2,5,10,21 46:1,6,9
<b>apply</b> 45:13 69:11	<b>assume</b> 11:15 49:12 70:5 86:9	71:8 72:6 73:17,24	46:13,19 50:24 70:20
			*
approaches 73:12	assuming 49:5	74:6,15,20 75:16	71:19,20,21 72:20,21
		76:13 78:11 85:2	74:14 75:4,6 84:6,8
appropriate	assuring	92:22 100:20 104:7	84:11 85:11 87:10,12
30:2,7 50:18 56:20	20:13	107:14	87:15,24 88:3,13,19
approval	as-built	backwards	89:12,16,23 90:1,13
21:12,16 26:9 27:6,9,9	88:11,13,18 89:1,5,6	38:9	90:18 91:7,8,24 92:4
27:17 28:9 29:7 30:5	89:21 90:14 91:9,15	bad	92:8,21 93:16 109:6
30:5,15 31:9,18	91:23	11:19	109:15
36:21 38:3,6,8,10	as-builts	balancing	best
40:7,11 47:14,16,21	89:7,13 90:4,10 91:24	74:8 102:23	112:9
48:6,16,21 49:7	attached	ballpark	better
55:11 57:4 60:4,16	23:13	71:9,11	35:16 39:13 41:12
60:22,24 62:3,10	attachment	Band-Aid	56:21 68:8 92:22
approvals	86:8,18 111:2	68:1	98:6,8
61:4	attention	base	Beverly
approve	110:14	24:5	22:14 110:1
27:15 28:5 32:4 48:17	attorney	based	beyond
106:4,4,4,14	96:13 102:21	4:20 46:13 73:1 81:23	43:11 46:20,21 48:8
approved	audible	106:10	51:1 64:22 66:2 76:8
12:19 39:22,24 40:2	40:20 47:10 80:14	bases	bidding
89:18	authority	9:12 41:24	74:3
approving	97:5	basically	big
32:22	available	18:6 50:17 76:4,12	104:9
arborist	50:5	86:11 108:7	biggest
17:9	avenue	basis	77:5
area	96:19	65:8 66:24 68:21	bike
67:5,6,10 70:5	avoid	105:4	10:21 11:8,9
areas	48:2	beginning	bit
48:1 82:13	aware	4:2 28:16	18:14 20:22 38:10
argument	51:15 60:19	believe	42:13 61:23 90:21
11:15	awful	16:18 17:6 35:21	92:7 102:20 103:3
arrived	68:7	40:24 48:2 66:11	blacktop
8:2,4 9:12		70:12 90:18	27:19 28:5
asked	B	believes	blah
23:19 66:23 108:4	b	64:24	15:16,16,16
109:19 110:6	47:7 102:6	belong	blame
asking	back	42:5	96:5
17:13 60:11 106:14	4:13 6:7 11:3,13 12:1	belt	blank
	I	I	I

53:16	72:7,12,19 74:4,17	71:22 72:24 73:3,5,6	54:5
blasting	74:21,23 75:2 76:11	73:9,21	case
63:8 68:1 73:1,2 75:12	76:17 77:6,12,19,22	building	1:6 14:4 51:3 82:12
86:10,19 95:3,8,10	78:2,8,16,20 79:5	2:12 9:10 24:12 25:21	98:24,24 101:16
95:10,16,17	80:22 81:1,9,18,24	43:2,4,11 44:2,6 45:2	106:2
Bluestein	82:5,6,22 83:1 85:24	45:13,18,21,23 46:4	cases
2:9	86:6 87:1 93:1,9,14	46:5,10,20 50:18,21	22:5
board	94:15,18 95:21 96:1	51:2 53:3 60:3,18,19	catch
1:5 2:2 3:8,9,13,24	96:4,6 97:18 98:1,14	64:13 66:11 69:14,14	53:20
14:1,9 15:18 56:23	98:17 99:2 100:19	70:4 75:10,11 83:16	catch-22
66:5 73:17 74:1,2,6	109:6 110:12 111:4	83:23,24 84:3,6,23	96:18
97:5 98:22 111:18	111:15 112:5,12,18	85:12 88:4,4,8,12,14	categories
boards	112:20,23 113:6,12	88:17,18,20,21,22,23	7:17,20 8:13 11:2
26:18 100:24	113:16 114:10	88:24 89:1,3,3,21	causes
board's	115:21 116:13	90:14 91:4,6,17	64:22 66:2 76:8
110:14	Book's	93:14 97:18,19 104:9	certain
bond	42:11 93:8	104:10 109:14,18,24	3:10 8:15 37:8 60:15
60:8,8 61:14,15,17	bordering	buildings	102:12 105:20
<b>bonded</b>	67:19	10:16 11:12 16:8 46:7	certainly
61:10	Boston	47:2,2,3,5,7 65:12	4:7 10:10 29:6 95:24
bonding	1:17	66:12 67:12 68:5	100:17 106:8
61:9,21	bothered	70:5 73:7 75:8 84:9	certainty
bonds	78:12	87:20 88:23 89:17,24	72:9 74:5
61:18	bottom	building-by-building	certificate
Book	23:23	65:8 66:24	53:2 91:5
		built	certificates
2:4 3:4,17 5:15,20,24	box 00.17		
6:3,4,8 11:3,13 12:17	99:17	43:15 75:9 88:15	89:13
13:23,24 14:13 15:6	brand	bushes	certification
15:13 16:23 17:1	48:14,17	22:3	43:6 44:10,13 45:1,12
20:16,17,19 21:5,10	breakdown	business	46:16 49:22,23 50:9
21:14,18 25:16 26:6	47:22	59:19	50:24 51:10,20,24
27:4 32:14 33:20,21	bring	bylaw	52:5,11
34:7 35:3,6,17 36:9	6:16,17 73:7	12:4,12 22:9,10,21	certifications
36:19 37:2,7,11,17	bringing	23:2,6,9 82:9,17,18	52:13
37:20,23 38:15 39:6	6:14 72:16	bylaws	certify
41:6,10,17 42:7,13	broad	23:3 57:5,9	42:23 43:24 44:1
42:16,23 43:2 49:8	24:23 36:23 57:3,7	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$	104:6 118:3,8
49:10,12,21 51:19,22	broader	$\frac{C}{C}$	certifying
52:8 54:1,7,10,20	105:6,16	_	50:17
55:2,4,6,18 56:12,19	Brookline	1:21 25:10 29:3,6,12	cetera
57:2 58:20 63:11	1:5,8,12 36:21 38:24	29:23 102:6 118:1	94:13,14
64:3,4,12 65:7 66:9	39:10 93:17	call	Chairman
66:18 67:1,4,16	build	4:6 49:15 65:3 101:14	2:3 49:16 74:7
68:14,23 69:3,13	12:19 13:10 65:9,21	116:23	challenge
70:7 71:15,18,20	68:12,19 69:1,7,9,10	care	91:18

chance	2:5 3:5 111:15	11:3,13 12:1 15:12	compare
5:2 17:24,24 74:15	circulate	18:11 65:5 66:4	39:16 82:20 88:15
75:15 113:2	84:4 112:13	67:14,18,20 69:11	89:18
change	circulation	72:6 73:17,24 74:6	compelled
12:3 14:6,9 15:4 21:13	25:9 39:7	74:15 75:15 78:11	98:7
24:10 25:23 47:7	citation	90:4 92:22 107:14	complete
63:18 77:16 78:4	23:1	comes	76:5 82:19
changed	cite	59:18,21	completed
80:22 81:2	22:23 63:8	comfort	58:19
changes	citing	76:10	completely
4:20 6:6 15:12,17	14:14	coming	29:14 65:15 100:2
38:18 40:2 56:2,3	Clarification	28:21 44:17 52:6	106:10
107:23 108:4 112:9	23:17	66:14 76:13	complex
112:10 113:2,11	clarified	commencement	9:14 25:21
114:15,17	108:22	45:6,8	complexities
changing	clarifying	comment	75:11
14:19	25:24 74:24	21:24 26:6 33:22 35:6	complexity
chaotic	clause	57:11 79:16 85:24	75:13
113:20	46:5 101:8	86:6 93:13 104:23	compliance
charge	clean	105:10	25:2
33:3	112:13,16 113:3,15,16	commenting	compliant
chart	cleaning	100:9	56:24
111:19,20	97:10	comments	complicated
chat	clear	3:10,24,24 4:7,10,18	67:9,9 75:6 115:9
57:6	5:12 27:3 34:12 49:22	4:20 7:12 10:15	comply
check	cleared	14:22 26:23 42:16	90:8 92:17
41:17,19 57:9 85:6,14	44:8	49:5,8,10 62:14	component
checking	clearing	93:18 95:23 96:1	9:13 97:10
48:8	45:7	102:14 104:5	components
checklist	clearly	commercially	50:6
25:22 51:12 58:20	77:18	79:1,3,5	comprehensive
92:12,16	close	commission	96:9,10 97:23
cherry	116:20	59:22 60:5,17 62:3	comprise
4:5	closed	118:16	69:8
cherry-picked	3:7 82:12,14	commissioner	concept
3:10	code	2:12 25:21 44:3 60:3	21:12
Chestnut	43:12 46:5,20,21 51:2	85:13 97:18	concern
1:7 2:14	51:12 84:7	commit	29:21 33:8,22 37:9
chief	codes	70:13 98:21,22	67:3,13
37:9,16 39:16 42:24	51:2	commitment	concerned
43:1,3 50:10,11	combined	70:14,16 71:9,10	32:21 81:7 105:15
51:10 53:16 86:22	20:20	committed	concerns
choice	combining	74:10	102:24 106:24
116:4,5	42:8	Commonwealth	conclusion
Chris	come	118:2	35:10 44:14 52:3

conclusory	considered	34:14,14	covers
32:20 34:1 35:7	14:8 103:15 109:21	contractor	15:23 16:11 42:6 82:9
concrete	consistency	18:16 67:11 73:5 74:1	82:16
48:12,15,17 104:24	26:12 38:8,11 39:11	contractors	crack
concur	40:12 47:21 48:8	75:7	89:10
66:21 75:3,14		control	critical
· ·	56:22 63:14 102:5,22 <b>consistent</b>	53:12 64:23 66:2 76:8	106:8,13
condenser			/
109:20,24	23:5 26:6,16 28:23	controlled	cross-referencing
condensers	37:13,24 38:2,20,21	46:5,12,14	54:17 81:22
108:13,20 109:7,12,18	39:9 41:16 47:15	conversation	cumulative
condition	construct	10:9,10 74:22 92:21	82:23
11:18 13:9 16:19	64:14 88:21,22,23	Corporation	curious
36:10 37:13 41:11	constructed	1:15	57:14 83:22 100:14
61:8 62:16 68:11	89:8 90:1	correct	current
74:12 82:10 96:13	constructing	6:2 14:16 17:15 23:23	98:2 113:8
106:5 108:23,23,24	65:11 69:21 73:24	25:13 27:7 29:9,12	currently
109:5,23 111:1	construction	31:7 34:19 37:8 40:3	25:17 112:14,17
conditioning	26:1 31:22,22 34:9,13	43:10 52:11,23 55:11	cut
109:12	43:16 44:9,18 45:7,9	57:18 58:10,17,21	27:23 67:20
conditions	46:5,14 56:17,22	60:12 71:14 72:7	
8:2 9:15,19 26:15 31:2	59:5,20 61:11,14	82:24 86:13 87:23	D
32:5 35:21 36:1,9,12	62:20 64:18 66:15	90:1 102:4 114:20	d
36:14,16,18,20 37:1	68:7 72:9 73:18,20	118:6,12	24:19 27:1,16 31:18
37:5,8,14,22 38:5,8	76:3,5,15,23 77:3	COs	46:24 47:7 59:13
38:12,23 39:2,12	78:20 79:22 80:11	66:17,23 87:7,19	102:6
42:8 58:12,23 60:16	83:19 84:9,15 96:15	cost	Dan
63:21 99:11,20	consultant	95:2	2:12 46:3
106:15,21,24 108:14	2:8 106:11	costs	darts
108:17 109:15	consultants	34:13 78:21	77:23 78:2
110:22 111:2,13,17	64:16 70:11	Counsel	date
114:18 115:15	consultant's	1:10	4:18 44:16 45:15
conform	86:11,20	course	dated
21:17 90:8	Consulting	72:5	3:16 108:1 118:13
conformance	2:13	court	day
39:1	contested	23:18 118:1	118:13
confused	37:15	courts	days
82:1	contesting	104:16,18	54:4,5,9 91:22 115:17
confusing	51:17	cover	115:21
5:23,23	context	16:7 24:14 41:24 95:1	deadline
connection	101:7 102:2,20	97:13	6:11,12,13
44:21	*	covered	dealing
44:21 consider	contextually 29:3		102:21
		7:8,9,13 63:8 64:5,6	dealt
69:4	continue	83:3,5 94:8 107:13	34:10
considerations	3:8 4:4	covering	December
115:15	contract	12:7	December

		I	
82:21 112:10	Deleting	95:2,9,11	6:16 7:20 9:3 58:18
decide	93:7	determination	discussed
11:22 29:7 69:1 97:11	deletion	12:2 32:7 48:22 94:13	4:6 26:7 35:21 36:1
decision	49:6 79:18	105:14	58:7 64:10 96:12
3:8,11,14 4:11,12 8:1	deliberate	determine	112:21
8:5 9:2,13,24 12:9	9:11	21:17 26:12 28:3,22	discussing
36:10,13,16 37:14	deliberately	39:1,11 114:4	111:13
38:6,9,12,23 39:12	9:1,5,6	determined	discussion
41:14 44:8 54:16	demonstrate	20:12 determines	3:8,12 8:18,19 9:5,23
58:9,15 82:20 92:18	33:17 49:23 60:2		21:11 23:17 29:18
94:15 98:8 101:10,11	density	18:5,17 30:1,7	63:20 104:15 107:6
101:12 102:15,15 104:14,19 105:7	101:3 103:18,19,20 104:7	determining 28:4 30:13	114:15,22 discussions
110:24 112:6,14	departing	detrimental	5:15 114:19
decisions	14:7	76:20	distinct
105:20,22	department	developer	69:10
declare	2:8 9:10 31:13 34:16	85:22	distribute
118:11	36:22 38:11 39:1,11	development	117:7
deed	43:2,4 44:6,22 47:1	56:16 61:19 63:13	ditching
60:20	60:19 64:13 90:10	difference	79:7
deemed	92:10 117:6	101:21	Ditto
15:18 77:16	departments	different	31:13 34:12 55:15
defer	45:17	10:3 14:15 15:7 38:5	57:19 79:14 85:6
96:24	depending	51:22 61:15,20 62:22	90:16 92:16
deferred	9:23 88:5	66:16 73:11 74:12	Ditto's
58:7	depict	75:7 82:2 83:13	50:8
define	26:10 28:9	87:14 89:13 90:4,9	docs
11:1 77:8	depth	difficult	82:20
defined	16:21 17:3,14,17	91:12 105:7	document
12:4 28:10,16 77:18	18:24 19:4	digital	6:6 9:21 99:23 102:16
definite	describe	91:21	107:16 108:7
60:16	34:7	dimensions	documentation
definitely	description	15:15	17:2
64:17 91:14	15:14	Direct	documents
definition	design	47:1	34:14 91:19 99:21
12:11,14 41:21 42:3	55:22 56:16,16 60:22	director	doing
definitional	designed	2:7 20:15 26:9 30:1,6	11:1 34:23 35:22 36:5
28:8	30:9	32:3 47:20 49:6	72:14 73:8 77:24
delegating	designee	55:12 57:19 79:15	78:1 114:1,2
56:19	11:14	83:20 85:4	dollar
delete	designs	discrete	99:5
15:21 77:10 93:9	56:7,17	114:21	double
deleted	detail	discretionary	41:17 57:9 78:20
34:3 54:17 81:2,18	22:8 31:20 46:18	32:8,9	doubt
82:4,8 93:10,23	details	discuss	91:20
	•	•	•

91:20	2:10,11	33:1,9 38:8,11 39:17	excellent
DPW	edition	47:15,20 48:19 76:3	4:15 5:4
55:13,16 90:3 91:10	82:2	enter	exception
draft	editions	40:17	13:9 58:12 94:6
3:16,18 4:24 5:6 8:9	5:1	entire	exhibit
8:13 13:18 71:1	effect	6:6 9:9 22:13 69:7	23:14 24:1
108:2 113:14,16	76:2,4	82:14	exist
drafted	effects	entirely	28:17
102:16	32:22	61:20	existing
dragged	efforts	entirety	97:12
73:15	65:24 76:3 78:22 79:2	81:2 82:5	expect
drainage	egress	entrance	11:13
75:13 105:2	39:18 40:17,22,23	79:22	expectation
drawings	41:3	entrances	65:10
43:8,16 44:9 45:15	eight-unit	79:23 80:8	experience
46:17 50:4,4 52:10	73:6 88:6	enumerated	71:21
52:10 56:22	either	28:11	expires
drive	44:23 58:13 75:22	equipment	118:16
12:9	84:13 111:1,23 114:1	80:17,20 109:10	explain
driveways	emails	erosion	73:17
90:7	111:16	81:13	explained
drop	emanate	Esquire	110:22
18:8	80:16,17,20	2:9,10,15	explaining
due	emergency	essentially	104:13
68:17 82:15	39:8,18 40:17,22	65:11 68:5	explanation
	employee	et	102:18
$oldsymbol{\mathbf{E}}$	118:9	94:13,13	express
e	encourage	evening	105:7
25:24 29:12,14,23	4:9 76:15	3:3 4:1	extend
30:6 59:15,17 60:2,4	encroaching	event	11:23
102:7	96:16	76:6,6	extension
earlier	enforcement	Eventually	65:5 66:5 67:15 74:16
5:1,10 36:1 63:20 75:5	15:9 29:5 82:16	45:5	75:16 77:15 78:15
82:2 114:16	engineer	everybody	extent
easement	45:16 50:2 52:15	3:16 36:6	8:14 15:2 33:23 99:16
63:14	engineering	Everybody's	103:1,12 106:21
easier	26:10 31:13 32:3	49:14	116:22
112:15	34:14 50:16 51:3	evidence	extremely
easily	55:12,13,16 57:20	63:12,12 106:11	105:7
75:9	79:15 83:21 85:1,5	exactly	E1
edge	92:9	5:13 7:10 10:7 34:11	69:1,7
22:3 91:17	engineers	114:5	E2
Edie	52:7		69:7
37:23 99:5 112:5		example 7:22 11:19 65:8 69:5	U7.1
Edith	ensure 18:23 19:8,9 25:22	70:13,16 71:9	$oxed{\mathbf{F}}$
	10.43 17.0,7 43.44	/0.13,10 /1.9	
		l	I

f	17:12 18:5,9,11,15	finish	form
25:17 26:1 27:17,24	18:17 19:4,12,12	55:4 91:20	92:13
31:8 63:11,18,18,19	23:12,16,16,20,21	finished	format
facility	109:13,18,22 110:1,2	55:3	4:17 91:21
55:22 56:7	felt	finite	forth
fact	96:16	107:4	118:5
35:8	fence	fire	forward
fair	22:5,15 24:13,13	36:6,22 37:9,16 38:11	4:24 70:23 71:12
42:12 69:23 75:2	110:4	38:24 39:11,16,18	81:10 92:9 97:11
106:18 111:10	field	42:24 43:1,3 44:6,20	104:16,17,18
fairly	18:8	44:21 45:16,17 47:1	foundation
13:20	figure	50:2,10 51:9,23,23	90:15 92:4
fall	71:10,11 74:1	86:22 95:2,17	four
8:14	fill	first	27:19
falls	81:23	3:7 6:7 8:11 21:2 40:4	fourteen
25:2	final	47:14 61:3 69:2	54:4
familiar	9:2 20:23 28:22 44:17	76:16 80:18 89:6,19	four-foot-high
8:5 9:8	47:19 56:16,21 91:9	97:4 99:4 100:19	22:5
far	91:15,21,22,23 94:15	fit	four-unit
8:9 98:8 103:11	115:14,15	7:17,20	88:6
fashion	financeability	fits	frame
21:15 98:15	65:19	103:6	73:1 77:2 103:5
faster	financially	five	framework
75:20,23	118:9	14:17 101:23 102:3	102:22
favor	financing	fixture	frankly
14:3	60:8,8 61:13,16,17,17	23:24	65:17
Fax	61:20	floor	free
1:18	find	1:11	115:14,14
feasibility	57:8 92:5,11 96:19	flow	front
18:5 72:4	101:22 102:6 103:5	49:24 52:4	80:8,16
feasible	106:10 109:1	fold	funding
	finding	104:13	59:19
18:17 20:12 65:23	8:19 13:24 66:11	followed	funds
76:3,16 78:14,16,19	6.19 13.24 00.11 <b>findings</b>	8:7	33:23 34:12
79:7	8:3,16 10:4 99:12	following	further
	101:2,13,15,17,19	7:7 26:10 28:10	4:7 33:2,13 38:18
<b>February</b> 117:14 118:13	103:2 105:11 106:9	101:23	63:13 118:8
federal	116:23		future
		foregoing	94:4
60:4 62:10	fine	118:4,6,12	94:4
feel	20:7 25:11 26:13,19	forget 93:1	G
98:7	26:20 46:23 47:6		Geller
fees	54:20 58:5 59:9	forgetting	2:3,13 3:3,4,21,23
33:3	77:21 84:5 85:17	101:9	4:15 5:3,13,21 6:9,13
feet	86:15 87:1 91:1	forgive	6:22 7:6,11,18 8:23
11:24 16:23,24 17:8	116:15	104:23	0.22 7.0,11,10 0.23

9:17,20 10:13,23	82:9,18 90:24	54:18 63:19 64:8	guess
11:5,7,11,19 12:6,13	generally	65:11 67:19 68:6.6	15:1 35:3 43:24 51:8
12:23 13:2,5,11,14	36:15 37:12 57:13	69:17,23 73:4,6,17	52:4 55:19 57:5,21
13:17,20,23 14:17,22	71:1,12 84:1	74:6 75:10,15,19	66:10 68:15 69:15
14:24 15:9 16:4,6,21	generated	77:17 78:3,4 79:12	74:12 92:14 96:8
16:24 17:2,6,10,13	101:4	80:17 81:10 82:7	97:2 104:3 113:6
17:18 19:11,20 20:4	generic	88:1,21 89:12,16,20	guys
20:16,18 21:7,9,19	64:12	89:21 90:3,6,8 91:10	117:10
20:10,18 21:7,9,19 22:1 23:11,15,19	getting	91:15,18 92:8 99:6	117.10
24:8,23 25:5,7 26:22	9:4 29:1 40:5 68:2	100:1 104:16,17,18	
29:14,17,22 32:12,15	75:17 104:12	105:8 107:3,5,10	half
			78:8
32:17 33:7,11,15,20	give 7:22 23:7 76:10 88:22	111:11,13 112:5,20	hand
34:6,24 36:6 40:14	97:19 103:16 112:8	good	10:3 17:23
40:19,21 41:2,5,15		3:3 8:24 10:11 16:3 19:23 29:5 34:21	handle
41:24 42:11,18,22	given		21:14
44:13 46:24 47:4,8	69:24 99:22	46:15 51:2 53:4,20	Hang
47:11 49:17,19 52:12	global	55:2 56:13 62:18	57:12
52:16,19 54:21,24	6:23 7:22 42:3 95:6	63:2,16 68:14 76:14	happen
57:11 58:16 63:3,5,7	globally	87:2 100:13 102:10	18:15 75:20 88:20
63:23 64:3,5 65:13	84:22	110:8,10 111:20	
66:19,22 67:2,13	go	112:4 113:19	<b>happy</b> 117:6
68:10,17 69:1,6,20	4:10,13 6:7,19 8:21,21	gotten	hard
70:19 71:16 72:2,8	10:3 14:11 28:13	3:14 4:1 114:8	
72:17 74:7 76:22	36:17 37:1 41:12	Goulston	29:5 66:11 99:9
77:8,13,21,24 78:6	46:21 57:7 58:8 60:7	2:15	hardship
78:12,18 79:18,21	63:20 71:8 74:19	grade	101:24
80:5,13 81:12,16	85:2 89:2 103:3,8,11	18:14 23:16,20,23	hate
82:6 84:16,19,22	104:3,20 109:20	24:4,10,16,21	102:18
85:23 86:1,5 87:6,18	116:19	grass	head
88:1 93:8,12,15,20	goal	48:12	54:14 55:15
93:22,24 94:21 95:22	18:3 115:24	gravel	heading
96:3 97:3,8,16 98:4	goes	28:6	79:9
98:13,15 99:3,10,14	9:24 61:7 87:18 102:8	great	headlight
100:4,6,11 101:9,16	104:7	6:3 53:17 82:22 83:1	22:2
102:1,9 104:22	going	92:23	headlights
105:24 106:23 107:3	4:2,23,24 5:1,6,16 6:4	greatest	24:15
107:7,20 108:11,19	7:5 10:8 14:5,15	15:2	hear
109:11 110:5,9,18	15:13 20:23 22:7	ground	9:10,11 18:19 71:1,15
111:5,9,21 112:1	24:14 28:21 30:18	97:1	heard
113:22 114:3,6,11,20	32:20 34:8,18 35:8	grown	101:8
115:6,11 116:7,10,17	37:4,16,24 39:17	9:16,17	hearing
117:11,13	41:19 43:15,24,24	Grub	1:5 3:7,13 35:20 37:23
general	44:14 45:12 46:4,16	93:15	71:7 110:16
12:16,18 20:19,19	47:13 49:2 50:3	grubbing	hearings
24:21 41:21 59:7	51:24 52:2 53:15	93:15	9:8 105:3
	•	•	•

	I		ı
height	43:24	107:18 108:6,17	important
23:22	humor	109:4,9 110:3 111:11	4:11 25:20,23 114:23
heightened	42:14	111:20 112:4 113:19	impossible
37:18	Hussey	114:1,5,21 115:8,13	19:1
held	2:5 3:5,17 4:14,22 5:3	115:17,22 116:2,5,8	improvements
9:2 65:2	5:11 6:10,14 7:4,10	116:21 117:2,8	10:18,24
help	7:15,19 8:17 10:11	Hussey's	Inaudible
66:4 101:6	13:16,18,22 15:1,23	100:9	23:17
helping	16:5,7,11,13,18		inches
58:17	17:20 18:4,13,18	I	27:19
high	19:3,9,17,19,24 20:6	idea	include
22:17	20:10 21:1,6,8,23	35:8 70:3 115:16	19:14 28:16 51:24
higher	22:2,13,16,20,22	ideal	52:2 83:24 101:11,18
23:12,16 24:16,21	24:9,18 25:1,4,6	31:21	included
highlight	26:22,24 27:20 28:1	ideas	56:17 81:8 95:16
110:13	31:4,8,11,15 32:15	103:17	108:2,9 111:3
highlighted	32:16 33:18 34:11,22	identified	includes
5:19,20 62:5 110:16	36:14 37:21 38:3	79:19 91:15	95:10
Hill	41:4 42:5,9,21 43:7	ignored	including
1:7 2:14	43:14,20,23 44:7,12	99:24	10:18 51:17 60:5 76:6
hinges	44:24 46:3,7,11,15	ii	84:1 86:21
97:5	46:23 50:1,9,14,16	19:18 38:17,18 39:9	inconsistent
Historic	50:22 51:8,13,18,21	39:14 40:9,10	56:4
60:7,9	52:7,9,18 53:1,7,12	iii	incorporate
Historical	53:20,22,24 54:12	19:11 63:19,19	112:21
59:21 60:5,17 62:2,15	55:8,11,17 56:15,24	imagine	incorporated
hits	57:12 58:5,22 59:2,4	56:1 98:10	5:24
54:14	59:6,9,15,18 60:1,13	immaterial	incorrectly
hitting	60:15 61:1,9,16,22	12:8	32:21
73:16	62:2,12,17,19 63:1	immediate	increased
hold	63:10,24 64:8 65:16	103:21	105:13
7:13 27:8	66:21 67:7 75:3	immediately 15:8	indented
Honestly	76:18 78:6,7,10,23		94:18
53:13	79:6,9,17,24 82:1,11	impact	independent
hoped	82:17 83:2,5,10,13	33:4 68:5 72:15 77:3 106:14	15:9 97:5
114:9	83:15,19 84:6,10		indicate
host	85:12,17,20 86:1,2,4	impacts 32:19 33:14 34:20	24:4,20 26:10 28:10
74:3	86:11,15,23 87:3,5		indicated
hot	90:23 91:3 92:2,24	35:4,12,14 impervious	74:8 76:18
5:9	93:2,4,7,13,19,21,23	31:21	indicates
hour	94:1,4,8 95:1,6,15,19	implication	17:3 45:14
115:5,6	95:22,24 99:18 100:3	50:4 82:13	indicating
housing	100:5,13,23 101:17	implicit	17:17
63:21 102:23 111:1	102:9 103:10,18	41:7 90:23	indifferent
how's	105:19 106:3 107:1,5	T1.1 70.43	35:17,18
	l	<u> </u>	

infeasibility	intending	iv	99:3,10,14 100:4,6
18:6	54:15	29:24 30:6	100:11 101:9,16
infers	intent		102:1,9 104:22
34:1	34:2	J	105:24 106:23 107:3
infill	intention	January	107:7,20 108:11,19
46:7	28:12 95:4	1:9 3:6,13,16 4:18	109:11 110:5,9,18
infinite	intentionally	35:20 108:1,2,6	111:5,9,21 112:1
11:22	54:16 81:18	110:16,21 113:14,16	113:22 114:3,6,11,20
inflation	interconnecting	jeopardizing	115:6,11 116:7,10,17
94:24	29:18	65:18	117:11,13
inform	interest	Jesse	Jesse's
104:16,16,17	72:10 102:11 111:12	2:3 3:3,4,20,21,23	35:6
information	interested	4:15 5:3,13,21 6:9,13	job
45:17 101:4 103:13	118:10	6:22 7:6,11,18 8:23	68:18 113:19 114:2,2
104:24 116:3	interim	9:17,20 10:13,23	Jonathan
infrastructure	23:11 36:7	11:5,7,11,19 12:6,13	2:4 3:4 21:2
84:12	internally	12:23 13:2,5,11,14	Joseph
initial	34:10 102:13	13:17,20,23 14:17,22	2:13
107:6	interpret	14:24 15:9 16:4,6,21	judge
initially	13:8	16:24 17:2,6,10,13	96:18
96:12	interpreted	17:18 19:11 20:4,16	judges
insects	13:6	20:18 21:7,9,19 22:1	8:8 105:20 106:1
83:8,12	involved	23:11,15,19 24:8,23	judgmental
inspector	8:8 75:7	25:5,7 26:22 29:14	8:7
83:16,23 84:1,3,24	issuance	29:17,22 32:12,15,17	judicial
install	61:18 87:8,21 88:10	33:7,11,15,20 34:6	8:6
45:12	88:17 91:5,23	34:24 36:6 40:14,19	jumping
installed	issue	40:21 41:2,5,15,24	85:19 111:3
109:13	33:19,19 42:6 61:10	42:11,18,22 44:13	juncture
instance	73:22 77:1 84:16,17	46:24 47:4,8,11	9:22 60:11
27:4 60:21 81:19 88:4	87:19 88:7 92:1,10	49:17,19 52:12,16,19	jurisdiction
102:2 104:5	93:8 100:16 115:10	54:21,24 57:11 58:16	59:21
instances	issued	63:3,5,7,23 64:3,5	jurisdictional
17:23 67:17 110:2	8:8	65:13 66:19,22 67:2	96:10
instantaneously	issues	67:13 68:10,17 69:1	
54:3	6:23 8:7 73:14 74:3	69:6,20 70:19 71:16	K K
insubstantial	104:3,8,12 105:23	72:2,8,17 76:22 77:8	Kathy
14:1,5,9 15:18 77:16	111:14	77:13,21,24 78:6,12	106:18
insufficient	items	78:18 79:18,21 80:5	keep
102:3	6:19 43:8 51:1 99:24	80:13 81:12,16 82:6	77:2 80:19 89:5
intend	114:21	84:16,19,22 85:23	kind
73:21 98:22	iteration	86:1,5 87:6,18 88:1	5:9 12:21 16:2 26:17
intended	107:21	93:8,12,15,20,22,24	38:9 59:3 61:7 92:7
6:11 13:2 16:7 30:19	It'll	94:21 95:22 96:3	99:1
37:19,20	62:9	97:3,8,16 98:4,13,15	kinds
I			

101:17	98:19	29:1 76:10	local
knew	latest	levels	26:18 60:4 62:10
99:7,8	13:18	105:21	102:5,22,24,24
know	law	Levin	103:12,13,14 105:21
5:8 6:17 8:24 9:23	94:9 96:8 98:3 103:6	2:14 70:10,12	locate
10:14 11:11 12:4,13	laws	Levin's	91:10
12:19,20,21 15:17	57:1	70:10	located
16:17 17:20 18:18	layers	light	30:18 108:13
22:4,16 27:18 29:4	31:22	24:6	locating
29:17 51:6,8 52:4	layout	lighting	108:20
53:13 54:13 59:19	90:7	16:8,20 22:23 23:1	location
62:4 65:10,20 67:11	leading	likelihood	30:15,20 88:14,19
68:9,18 69:15 70:3,5	68:13	67:19	89:17,22
71:7,24 72:13 78:16	learn	limit	locations
78:19 81:4,5 88:19	117:9	37:4 65:1	15:16 80:3 91:17
89:16 92:12,24 101:7	leave	limitation	logic
101:14 102:10,13	21:2 31:15 35:16	10:18 13:3,6 26:17	102:12
105:1,17 106:4,9,18	41:18 54:18 59:10	limited	logical
107:10,15 113:5	76:7 78:5 79:6 85:21	107:4	59:3 98:11
115:1 116:15,24	91:6 114:3	limits	lonely
knowledge	leaving	75:18	116:18
72:1	8:4 21:11,12 116:12	Lincoln	long
knows	leeway	1:16	29:17 31:12 41:15
82:7	14:10	line	longer
Krakofsky	left	4:17 6:1 22:14 24:4,14	63:18 75:10 76:9
1:21 118:1,15	3:4,5 4:3	24:22 32:18 34:7	77:19,22 78:3 115:5
Kristen	LegaLink	69:15,17 82:23 89:2	115:6
1:21 118:1,15	1:15	109:22	look
Krokidas	legitimate	lines	5:2,7 12:11 16:19
2:9	102:24	4:17	58:14 60:14 66:8
	leisure	lining	69:23 71:6 73:22
L	110:24	5:21 113:9	86:8 87:12 90:6
lacking	lengthy	list	96:23 106:8 107:17
55:20	72:9	29:6 103:14 108:6	looked
landscaping	letter	115:14	86:10
3:15 20:23	44:1,4,9 100:14	listing	looking
lane	let's	11:2	24:3 37:6 44:15 45:11
39:19	7:13 11:22 22:20	litigation	46:19 52:15 63:18
language	24:16 35:9 36:2 43:5	94:4,7 96:19,20	81:15 90:9,11 92:11
20:8 24:23 26:15	57:7,9 58:8 59:9	little	92:12 113:4 114:15
27:23 29:24 30:6	61:2 69:13 74:19	18:14 20:21,22 38:9	looks
32:21 50:12 69:6	77:22 78:10 79:8	39:19 42:13 61:23	23:22 85:17
76:1,7 87:17 92:22	87:14 91:4 100:11	65:16 67:7 82:1 90:8	loose
97:14	104:21 116:19	90:20 92:6 94:1	51:16
larger	level	96:18 102:19 103:3	lose
	I	ı	I

	1	1	
116:10,14	2:14	measured	minutes
lost	Maria	23:20	6:18
80:22	2:8 16:14 17:5 23:23	meet	misremembering
lot	25:13 52:23 53:18	51:12 115:18	17:15,18
24:20,21,22 29:2	55:9,23 106:20	meeting	missed
46:16 62:14 67:10,10	111:21 112:12	3:7 7:21 59:13 115:10	44:23 48:24
68:7 73:10,10 99:19	Maria's	115:20 117:13	missing
103:12 106:17	106:16	members	28:13 45:19 81:7
109:22	Mark	2:2 3:9 106:1	mistake
lots	108:12	memo	14:20
22:3,17 69:8	marked	86:11	misunderstood
lousy	5:7 107:22	memorialize	111:16
114:2	Mark's	71:3	mitigate
low	108:12	memos	32:18 33:4,14 34:20
48:1	Mass	111:16	34:21 35:7,10
lying	59:21 60:7,9,17 61:18	mentioned	mitigation
48:1	62:15	74:11 75:4 111:15	33:24,24 34:2 35:3,11
L902	Massachusetts	mere	35:14
24:10,17,18	1:12,17 60:5 62:2	102:2	modified
	118:3	Merrill	38:21 39:9
<u> </u>	massive	1:15	Monday
M	72:14	method	100:10,12 107:8,14
2:10,11	material	59:8	111:11 112:6 114:14
magnitude	10:18,24 11:9 12:10	methodology	115:8,11,13,24 117:3
71:22	68:7	69:21	117:7
main	materials	methods	monthly
10:11	26:1 31:23	18:22 19:1,6,7	57:15 58:3 83:6,8,9,21
maintain	matter	middle	84:15
41:7,9,14,18,23 42:1,4	25:24 26:11 51:11	15:1 73:11 97:1	months
42:10	63:14 101:11	midrise	70:7 71:22 74:10 78:5
maintained	mean	16:22 17:4 39:19 65:8	78:7,10
81:19 109:13	12:4,15 21:14 25:10	69:10 73:5,8 75:8	moot
maintaining	27:21,22 28:11 33:3	88:7	98:23
19:13,14,21	33:6 36:10 37:7,15	mind	Morelli
maintenance	42:9 43:8,14 47:24	49:15 77:1	2:8 16:16,19 17:8
18:1,2 20:4 54:21 55:1	50:2 55:3 56:2 58:16	mine	18:15,20 19:7 22:12
80:20	64:24 89:10 91:3	90:13	22:19,21,24 23:3,7
making	104:2,5,14 106:5,8	minimize	24:1,5 25:14,19 26:4
10:24 11:3 51:19 52:9	106:16 112:17 115:2	67:17	27:1,7,11,13 29:9,16
74:12	means	minimum	29:20 30:3,8,16,22
management	18:22 19:1,5 20:13	16:21 25:10,11	31:1,7,19 32:2,9
47:19 66:16 73:18	78:15,16,19 110:19	minor	35:19,24 38:16 39:3
manholes	114:1 115:4	15:11	39:14 40:3,10 41:1
91:11	meant	minute	43:3,10,18,22 44:2
Marc	12:21,22	64:1,8	47:17,24 48:7,10,19

16:22 48:23 49:4 50:10 84:14,18,20 85:2,10 11:6,10,18 12:1,11 51:11 52:24 53:6,8 nearby 12:15 13:19 14:2,11 85:14,19 86:3,7,13 21:20 86:16,20,24 87:2,4 53:13,19 55:10,15,24 14:14,19,23 15:4,10 56:9,14 57:18,24 necessarily 15:22 16:3,10,12,14 87:10,16 88:9,16 58:4,10 70:12,15 10:8 18:21 33:5 50:2 16:17 17:5,11,16,22 89:9,14,19,24 90:12 71:5 79:11,14 80:2,3 72:13 74:10 18:10,18 19:8,15,18 90:16,20 91:2,22 80:9,12 82:8,16,18 19:20 21:13,16,22 92:6,14,23 93:3,6,10 necessary 85:7,9 86:18 90:22 19:16,22 42:1,4 51:7,9 22:23 23:1,5,13,21 94:3,6,10,19,23 95:4 95:2 106:16 95:7,12 97:14,21 95:7,9,18 107:24 24:3,7,17 25:3,11,15 108:5,8,16,24 109:3 26:3,5,13,19 27:8,12 98:9 99:7,13 100:2 need 109:12 110:15,21 12:1 18:13 22:21 27:16,22 28:2,12,18 100:10,17,21 101:6 113:14 27:20 29:7 30:4,9 28:21 29:10,23 30:4 101:13,19 102:19 30:12,20,24 31:5,8 mosquito 31:5 32:3 36:22 103:16 104:19 106:7 39:23 40:7,10 45:10 31:14,17,24 32:6,10 53:12 107:13 108:3,9,14,18 mounting 46:16 47:16,21 48:5 32:24 33:9,12,16 108:22 109:2,5 110:8 23:22 48:7,21,22 53:2 70:4 34:17,23 35:1,5,13 110:10,13,23 111:7 74:6 75:12 78:15 35:19,22 36:2,12,15 111:19,24 112:8,16 move 4:8 5:7 57:10 76:12 112:19,22,24 113:10 82:10 88:13 89:1 36:24 37:4,10,12,19 79:8 97:11 116:24 91:14 92:6 93:14,16 38:13,19 39:4,7 40:1 113:13,18,21,23 95:9.11 96:4 102:23 40:7,13,16,24 41:8 114:8,13,24 115:7,16 moving 69:3,4,15,16 75:23 106:5 109:4 115:17 41:12,17 42:15 43:1 115:19,24 116:4,14 mud needed 43:5 44:23 45:4,8,19 116:19,22 117:4,9,12 98:18 109:2 110:17 5:12 45:23 46:2 47:3,6,13 never 47:18 48:4,9,16,21 multiple needlessly 54:15 100:15 101:8 40:6 66:23 79:22 87:7 67:14 72:6 49:2,5,9,11,14,18,20 104:4 113:21 87:19,19 needs 50:7,11,15,19 51:6 new 30:10 97:14 114:17,18 25:22 31:18 94:18,19 51:16 52:14,17,21 N 102:5,22 103:12,13 53:4,10,15,20,23 night Nagler 103:15 54:4,9,11,13,23 55:3 117:7 2:9 3:20.22 12:18 13:1 nit-picking negative 55:5,7,21 56:6,10,13 13:4,7,12 14:3 15:20 72:15 57:5,16,21 58:2,6,11 29:11 16:1 20:8,11 26:14 neighborhood 58:17,21,24 59:3,7 nobody's 26:20 28:7,15,19 68:5 72:10.16 76:15 59:11,16,23 60:10,14 51:17 34:3 38:4 40:4 60:7 100:24 103:21 104:7 60:23 61:2,5,12,24 normal 61:3,6,14,17 62:6,14 neighborhood-expr... 62:4,9,13,16,18,22 109:19 63:16 65:20 77:14 111:12 normally 63:2,4,6,9,15,17 64:6 79:1,7 94:11,17 96:5 neighbors 64:10,15 65:14 66:13 101:14 96:7 97:7,15,22 98:2 62:15 75:18,22 99:20 70:9,14,18,21 71:11 **Notary** 98:10,19 101:21 103:23 104:6 111:17 71:19 74:19,22,24 118:2,15 102:4,21 110:19 neither 76:1,12 77:10,17 note name 22:6 78:4,22,24 79:3,8,10 4:16 3:4 Netter 79:16,20 80:2,6,10 notes national 2:10,11 4:9 5:8,12,14 80:15,24 81:4,14,17 106:20 118:7 105:21 5:18,22 6:2 7:16 81:21 82:3,19,24 noticed near 8:11 9:16,18 10:21 83:4,7,12,14,17,24 14:14 65:17

noticing	88:5	83:15 85:10,20,22	68:11 115:8
79:11	occur	88:9 90:22 92:6 93:3	outcroppings
notification	76:15	93:4,4,5,6,20 94:8	21:4
47:1	oddly	95:12,19 96:6 98:14	outline
notion	9:21	100:12 105:6,14	9:12 36:17 37:1
78:13 87:7	offending	107:7 109:11 110:18	outlining
November	42:11	111:6 112:7,12,23	83:21
118:16	offhand	113:13 114:6	outside
nub	71:7	Once	21:20,22 99:11,17
8:24	Office	46:18	overarching
nuisance	1:10	ones	26:14
77:3	official	11:5 89:7	overlap
number	84:2	ongoing	20:22
1:6 6:15 11:18 13:9	officials	91:13 96:19	overtime
49:20 64:20 65:23	56:20 85:15	onset	75:23
66:1,3,3,4 81:3 82:2	oh	35:24	owe
87:12 88:24 89:1,2,3	3:23 24:7 28:13 35:22	opaque	99:5
89:3 101:23 103:23	40:17 41:2 42:7	22:5,15	O&M
103:24 111:16	43:20 50:11 55:17	open	48:13
numbered	58:2 60:23 61:5 63:6	3:15 24:11	
86:16	70:14 81:5 84:2 88:9	open-ended	P
numbering	91:2 99:7 100:17	104:15	page
80:22 81:9,19,22	111:5,24 113:4	operating	23:7,8,10
numbers	okay	92:19	Pages
14:15 23:7 81:23	4:19,21 6:9 7:6,8,14	Operation	1:2
88:21 94:24	10:6,11,13,22 13:2	54:21 55:1	paragraph
	13:11,14 14:13,18	opinion	80:23 81:1,11,12
O	16:3,6,13 17:19,20	8:1 98:7 101:5,8	Pardon
object	20:18 21:5,7,9 22:1	opinions	50:15
98:16,17	22:22 23:8 24:8 25:3	8:8 105:22 116:24	parenthetical
objective	25:5,7 29:22,23	opportunity	34:8
18:23	30:12 31:10,12,19	6:5 65:5	parking
obligated	32:1,10,12,15,16,24	opposed	11:17 22:3,17 24:11
97:19	33:18,19 34:17 38:13	97:2	24:15,20,21 90:7
observation	38:19 40:5 41:5	optimum	91:17
104:8	42:22 43:23 44:12	80:19	part
obtained	46:2,15,23 47:8,11	order	40:5 45:4 50:20 59:16
62:11	47:16 48:23 49:2,4,6	4:4 43:15 59:4 80:19	68:4 72:13 92:2,18
obviously	49:9,16 52:8 54:9	ordinances	100:17 104:20
9:2 102:12	55:17 56:10,12 58:2	97:12	105:22 108:7
occupancies	58:3,5 59:6,9 60:15	original	particular
88:24	61:2 63:1 64:2,4	81:16 82:14 112:10	3:12 24:9 30:22 50:6
occupancy	71:13 72:10 74:21	originally	75:14 104:9 116:23
53:3 91:5	77:8 78:24 79:8 81:4	28:24 66:15 87:11	parties
occupy	81:17,24 82:22 83:12	ought	40:6 118:9
	I	I	I

parts	62:11 88:22 103:4	85:18 90:24 92:15	point
38:20 103:19	perpetuity	118:5	4:3 22:12 23:2 27:1
paved	15:3	placed	35:19 38:16 44:17
10:16 11:12	person	58:23	63:16 73:22 76:19
pavement	84:4	places	100:1 102:10
91:17	personally	22:4	points
paving	66:5	plan	75:6
48:12 70:5	person's	10:19,20,20 12:20	pole
pay	34:4,5	17:7 18:1,2 19:21	24:6
99:8	pertain	22:2,7 24:10,18	police
PDF	6:23	28:10 29:21 32:1,2	95:2,9
91:21	pertaining	48:2 53:10,11,12	poorly
pedestrian	105:1,2	62:20,20 66:16 68:19	38:14
_	*	*	
25:8 33:1,2,10,13	pertains	73:19 83:9 88:18	porous 31:20
35:14	16:20 26:1	89:6 91:16	
peer	Peter	planning	portions
105:11	34:11 55:15,24 57:6,8	2:7,8,8 9:11 11:14,15	73:3
PEL	57:19 79:14 85:9	20:14 33:14 99:22	position
96:8,20 97:6,6 98:1,3	92:4,5,11	111:18 117:6	52:1
98:11 100:14	Peter's	plans	possible
penalty	49:1	17:14,16 20:23 25:18	15:2 68:2 77:4 107:15
118:11	phase	25:20 26:1,3,4,8 27:2	112:13 115:1 117:4
pending	91:4	27:16 28:8,11,13,15	post
96:15 97:20	phased	28:16,20,22,23 29:4	5:21
penultimate	65:13,14 66:10	29:12,15 30:10 31:1	potential
15:14	phases	31:3,20,20 32:4	105:13
people	66:16 68:13	38:17,21 39:9,15,16	powers
3:6 73:7 75:23 104:16	phasing	39:17,23 43:13,19,21	96:17
percent	67:3 68:20,23 69:4	44:15,18,20 47:15,19	practice
74:15 90:19	73:20	48:13 56:3,5 62:23	51:3 53:14
period	phrase	79:12,19 88:15 89:18	practices
54:2 64:14,18 71:23	21:20 30:11 32:18	planting	52:19 95:13
72:9,22 73:16,23	80:18 104:24	16:22 18:14 19:7	prebuilding
74:18 77:3 94:12	physically	plantings	59:4 60:1
periodic	43:12	18:1,24 19:22 21:3	precise
84:7	pick	plants	58:18
perjury	4:3 42:2	18:3 19:10 20:1,14	preclude
118:11	picked	play	97:21
permit	4:5	42:12	preconstruction
45:3,14,22,23 46:10	piece	please	59:13
50:18 59:4 60:1,18	67:22 97:17 109:9	39:6 80:24	prefer
90:14 93:14,15,16	pieces	pleasure	8:22 19:3 35:18 98:5
96:9,11 97:19,23	69:22 97:3 104:24	79:4	preference
101:7,22 102:2,7,20	place	plural	65:1
permits	18:11 31:6 41:13	36:14 80:4,7	preferred
Permin	10.11 31.0 71.13	30.1100.7,7	protetrou
	I	I	I

69:21 procedures 109:17 111:17 p.m preliminary 96:21 proposing 1:9 3:2 117:14,15 39:15,23 43:19 44:5 61:19 proceed 0 protection 56:3,4,15 62:19 7:9 60:18 qualifications prescribed proceedings 44:20 45:16 51:23,23 76:18 18:21 3:1 8:6 117:15 118:4 104:1 qualified presentation provide process 52:6 61:23 62:1 9:9,14 15:10 27:9 48:6 20:13 31:24 32:2 41:6 110:17 Qualifier preserved 65:6 90:24 91:19 41:13,14,20,22,23 65:23 66:1,3,3,4 20:24 99:1 42:1,3,4 48:13 57:9 qualifiers press processes 61:8 73:19 79:12 65:21 5:9 92:8 83:20 100:21 quarterly proffered provided pressure 58:1 49:24 50:5 52:4 35:9 3:10,16 34:15 70:13 question pressures progressively 105:3 5:4 8:24 15:2 17:11 51:4 89:7 provides 18:10 23:12,19 24:10 45:16 presume project 25:16 30:3 43:7 46:3 37:7 21:21,22 22:15 25:21 provision 49:21 53:1,4 60:10 presumption 32:19 33:4 35:12,14 73:19 77:11 64:12 65:18 66:23 20:1 46:8 52:2 61:10 **Public** 67:2 68:11,14 69:23 64:14 65:13.15 66:6 90:10 118:2.15 pretty 69:24 70:19 71:16 12:16 66:10,17 67:9 69:7,9 pulling 72:18 76:16 80:6 70:1 71:22 72:14 prevent 68:1 86:7 87:15 92:14,20 67:21 74:5 75:6,14 82:14 purpose 96:20 99:10,19 previous 83:22 84:21.23 87:22 33:23 102:17 108:3.11.12 50:23 83:6 purposes 89:8 91:12,14,19 109:19 110:6 115:4 previously 103:9,20 106:15 20:24 questioning 64:11 projects pursue 57:3 68:15 98:18 prior 95:17 94:12 auestions project-wide 15:8 42:2 45:2,20,21 push 6:20,24 7:5,7,11 13:22 34:18 50:19,20 53:16 73:23 88:2 75:1 99:15 107:19 87:8,20,21 88:9,16 prolonged pushed 108:4 91:4 117:7 68:3 9:5.6 auick probably properly pushing 71:2 10:21,23 25:1 41:13 30:5 92:3 quickly 52:5 72:24 74:14 property put 68:2 76:16 77:4 21:20,22 22:13 24:14 79:12.17 85:20 96:7 8:16 10:21 11:16 quite 98:20 103:10 52:20 60:21 42:13 50:19 54:6 34:12 50:23 51:5 problem proposal 57:14 70:22 71:12 59:23 65:17 82:2 28:8 33:5 41:8 110:3 4:1 73:2 76:1 80:7 87:17 103:11 111:20 112:4 112:24 98:7 109:7,17 propose quote problems 68:18 108:10 putting 93:16 75:18 17:21 99:20 proposed quote/unquote procedure P.C 33:24 35:3,11,13 28:20 92:19 57:24 70:1 96:13 2:11

	51:14 58:22 63:7	97:17	94:11 109:14
R	reasonable	redundant	regulations
rack	64:14,23 66:2 71:18	50:14 51:15 52:12	14:6 57:1 96:23
10:21 11:8,9	71:21 74:18 76:8	red-lined	relate
raise	77:15 78:22 79:2,4,4	4:19	7:7
4:7 18:13 107:8,11	79:5 98:9	refer	related
raised	reasonably	21:20 87:20	24:11 84:12
65:17 108:12 114:22	13:8	reference	relative
raises	reasoning	19:13 72:22 95:5	118:8
8:23 102:9	8:15 101:12,14 105:4	101:10	relevant
raising	reasons	referenced	37:21
6:23 9:1 68:10 106:24	8:5 10:6	10:19	reliance
ramp	recall	referred	105:2
75:20	3:6,9 70:11,15 71:5	112:1	relocate
rational	72:24	referring	38:23
36:20	receival	10:15 83:18 87:23	rely
reach	54:4	102:11 111:5,24	69:20
22:17	receive	refers	remarks
read	54:2	87:21	65:19
5:2 24:16 27:18 28:3	recirculate	Refined	remedy
32:21 39:5 94:1	111:22	107:5	98:11
110:23 111:1,2	recitation	reflect	remember
reader 42:19	102:3	32:4 103:2 107:1,6	22:13 72:2 109:2
	recognize	108:4	110:5 111:22
reading 94:3	105:12	reflected	remove
readthrough	recollection	38:17 102:14,15	35:10 37:17
112:15	71:8 72:21	reflecting	render
realize	recommend	15:10	66:6
67:5	8:15 110:23	reflection	rendered
really	recommendation	59:12	105:20
4:11 8:5 9:4 10:16	57:22	reflects	renumber
13:8 25:22 29:2,5	recommended	3:19,24 107:22	54:15 58:24
31:17 33:13 34:23	109:16	reframe	repair
54:24 56:9 68:16	recording	102:19	54:22,23 55:1
71:23 87:23 92:7,15	63:12,13	reg	repeat
92:19 102:5,8 104:15	red	26:17	47:17
105:5 106:7,13,22	4:16,17 5:21 6:1 82:23	regarding	rephrasing
113:7 114:13 116:3	113:9	101:3	98:5
116:24	redesigning	regardless	replace
Realty	32:24	92:17 97:8	42:1,4 54:22,23 55:1
1:7 2:14	redo	regs	replaced
rear	36:2	26:16 61:8	20:3
109:24	reducing	regular	replacement
reason	110:1	80:19	19:14
6:14 45:11 46:19	redundancy	regulation	replacing
	•	•	

19:15,15,22 20:5	40:20 47:10 80:14	6:3 11:10 16:15 17:10	14:3 15:3
report	rest	18:4 20:4,6,10 22:19	Russett
48:13 83:6,21 84:15	40:11 91:6	24:9 25:13 27:19,24	22:14 110:2
86:20	restore	28:18 29:8,10 31:6	R1-1
reporter	98:12	31:18,24 32:1,6,17	31:4,5
1:21 23:18 118:1	restriction	32:19 33:11,12 34:6	31.4,3
	12:22 14:8 15:3 60:20	34:11,22 37:10 39:19	S
reports 53:8 83:16 84:7	63:13	43:22 44:7 45:13	safety
	restrictions		33:1,2,10,13 35:15
represented		46:15 48:6,9 53:15	36:6
43:12 71:4	14:5 76:23	55:23 56:19 57:2	sake
represents	retaining	60:21 62:24 64:9	11:15
71:2	11:23	67:1,4 69:8 70:18	Sam
request	return	71:3 75:2 80:8 84:10	106:18 116:17
51:10 57:22 115:3	36:1 99:4	84:19 86:8,12 88:22	
requested	review	94:17 95:20 97:6,15	Samuel
23:18 51:14 96:14	6:5 18:1 21:17 26:8,12	97:22 98:2,2 99:2	2:9
108:4	26:17 27:6,14 28:9	100:23 101:16 102:1	satisfaction
requesting	36:21 38:2,6,7,10,11	103:9 106:23 107:1,5	20:14 60:3
88:24	38:24 39:10,24 40:11	108:15 110:18 111:4	satisfy
requests	40:11 47:20 56:21	113:17,23 114:24	38:18
99:19	57:4 59:4 60:2 96:20	116:21	save
require	105:12	rights	6:18 7:13
18:9 46:11,21 50:5	reviewed	26:17	saw
51:3 84:7 95:16	7:1 9:22 36:8 39:22	risk	17:7
required	40:1 44:5 45:17	59:1	saying
16:22 35:11 60:4,17	47:15 57:22 86:21,21	Road	18:19 20:22 30:4 32:6
61:4,6 62:7,7,7,8,10	96:22 113:1 114:16	22:14 110:2	34:19 35:7 38:20
94:12 97:19	reviews	roadway	40:8 41:9,22 45:11
requirement	26:15	39:8	48:4 50:7,12 59:24
12:18 13:13 60:16	revised	rock	60:24 61:7 71:3
96:10	3:18 108:14 109:3	21:4	89:11 106:6 110:11
requires	110:20	room	113:4,5,6 115:23
46:22 51:2 60:8 67:11	revising	65:3	says
106:3	39:17	rounded	15:15 16:2 19:11 22:8
reread	revisions	94:23	22:10 23:21 26:7
40:16 64:19 106:19,19	86:14 112:6	rubbish	28:8 30:6 33:16 38:5
106:20 110:24	revisit	62:19,20,22 95:20,23	38:7 39:4 61:4 84:14
resend	6:4 7:14 36:1	96:2	94:11 101:22
112:3	reword	rule	scale
Residences	19:3	104:4	72:14
1:8	reworking		schedule
respect	22:7	run 6:7 15:4 116:6	75:5
_	22:7   <b>rid</b>		schematic
30:14 49:6 52:20	<b>ria</b> 89:6	runoff 82:15	56:16
67:24 68:17			scheme
response	right	runs	Scheme

98:19	4:14 8:16,17 9:24	shorthand	19:22 24:10 25:17,20
Schwartz	29:19 42:12 74:17	118:7	26:2,7 27:10 28:8,10
2:15	98:20 103:24 104:2	show	28:15,20,22,23 31:19
screening	107:9	24:12 44:18 78:13	38:21 39:7,9 48:2
16:13 21:3 22:3	sentence	81:6 89:7 91:16	73:4 75:13 84:12
			88:14 97:10
<b>second</b> 21:3 23:9 40:5 57:12	15:7,8,14,21,22,23	113:3	sites
	16:2 22:8 40:4,15	showed	
59:16 72:13 97:10	47:14	17:14	75:8
second-guess	sentences	showing	six
68:18	91:11	20:24 81:5 103:19	14:17,19 23:2 109:13
second-to-last	separate	shown	109:18,22,24
15:21,22	8:18,19,19 21:1,6 46:9	25:17,19,24 27:2,5	sixth
section	serious	28:19 29:20,24 31:21	32:18
3:14 4:4 6:9 10:4,13	72:23	43:16,18,20 44:20	six-foot-high
10:14 14:15,18 16:6	service	46:17	24:13
16:10,14 20:18 21:19	51:5	shows	size
23:2,10,12 24:19	services	22:2,4 25:15 32:1	15:15 74:5
25:7 32:13,17 42:2	34:15	107:16 112:9	slightly
47:12 58:16	set	shut-offs	24:15
sections	16:5 42:21 72:5 86:4	91:10	slow
3:11,12 4:5 7:1,2,8,12	95:19 118:5	sidewalks	42:18
7:14 8:12 36:7	setback	29:21 30:9	small
114:16	109:8,17 110:1	sign	86:13
see	setbacks	30:23 50:3 85:21	smaller
4:12,17,19 8:9 9:15	108:13,21	signage	73:6,9
11:9 22:20 24:18	seven	39:8	soft
31:9 52:12 59:6	54:5	signs	104:2 105:23
60:23 82:11 87:12,14	seven-foot-high	27:2,12 30:14,17	soil
89:20,21 110:24	22:15	sign-off	18:24 19:4
113:2,9 116:19	sewer	92:9	sole
seeing	83:10 85:3 90:2	silent	44:14
30:6 111:22	shape	97:2	solely
seen	30:15	similar	20:23
7:24 56:15 67:18	share	13:21 21:15 50:23	solid
100:15 113:4,21	8:15	simply	110:4
114:17	shared	35:7 59:11 100:8	solution
segmented	5:10	simultaneously	18:22 104:10,11,11
75:8	shielded	66:13 68:6 73:4,9	somebody
selected	22:9,11	single	52:6 54:14
48:14	shining	70:1 79:21	someplace
selectmen	16:8	singular	94:9
14:4	shop	36:10	somewhat
send	45:15	sit	7:22 13:1 50:14,23
sena 117:5	45:15 <b>short</b>	92:5	97:1 103:20
sense	71:23 72:15	site	soon

107:15	specified	112:14,17	stormwater
sorry	43:16	Stantec	47:11,19 48:2,13,20
3:23 14:21 19:17	specify	2:13	55:18 82:9 83:11
21:10 22:24 27:23	87:7	start	85:4
28:7 36:4 37:2 45:19	specifying	4:2 6:10,18 42:7 45:6	Storrs
47:18 50:11 59:23	18:5	46:18 61:11 67:12	2:15
61:20 63:6 83:4,17	specs	69:13,14,14,17 73:8	straight
87:5 110:19	48:11,14	73:10 88:24 91:20	4:23
sort	spec'd	started	Street
7:4 8:1,4,18,19,20 9:3	30:18,23,24	68:24 81:23 99:4	1:11,16
9:6 11:1 37:18 44:4	spelled	107:16	strictly
45:14 57:13 65:7	76:24	starting	44:21
68:1 75:19 77:14,23	spoke	25:8 69:3,13,16 75:1	strikes
83:22 99:14,17	112:2	starts	71:23
100:14 102:13,13,16	spoken	81:22	struck
105:15 107:8	74:2 103:23,24	state	57:14 98:11
sound	spot	57:1 60:4 62:10 76:11	structure
74:9	92:13	84:20 105:21	9:3 12:3,17 87:9,22
sounds	spread	stated	98:23 109:21
80:17,21 100:13	67:10 85:18	98:6 103:14,14	structures
South	sprinkler	statement	10:16 11:12 12:12,16
1:8	44:19 45:12 50:3 51:5	17:16 57:8 72:23 91:1	88:5
space	stabilized	96:8	struggle
3:15 24:11 94:20	80:11	stating	91:8
spaces	staff	105:19	studies
11:17	3:10,24 4:18 25:21	status	101:3 103:19 106:19
speak	27:14 86:21 99:22	83:22 98:3	stuff
49:14 56:9	106:17	statute	46:16
speaking	stage	101:22	sub
40:6 72:3,3 101:17	45:1	stay	25:10
105:5	stamp	115:5	subbase
special	50:3,16	Steinfeld	27:21
101:7,21 102:2,7,20	stamping	2:7 40:9 95:14 112:3	subcategory
103:4	52:10	117:5	3:15
specific	standard	step	subject
6:24 7:2 26:16 28:11	14:6 33:10 53:14	89:19	26:8,12 27:5 28:9
28:16 30:16 80:3	90:13 92:19 95:12	Steven	36:21 38:2,6,7,10,24
84:24 87:9,22 97:16	102:5	2:15	39:10 64:22 66:1
101:9	standards	stone	76:7,22
specifically	52:19 102:3	49:3	submit
11:20 51:9,14 61:8 62:15 66:22 70:10	standing 47:22 48:1 97:6	stop	20:23 44:9 47:19 submitted
72:23 99:23		27:2,12 30:14,17,23 74:22	25:18 27:14 28:24
specifications	standpipe 44:19	stopping	48:11 53:2,8 56:2,23
43:9,17	stands	100:8	91:21
73.7,17	Stallus	100.0	71,41
		l	l

	ı	1	1
submitting	suspect	54:8,9	4:11,22 7:20 8:13,18
89:6	12:5	tension	8:23 10:8 12:10,17
subsequent	suspended	72:2,3,11	13:7,12 15:20 16:1
4:18	117:15	term	18:2 19:24 20:11
subsidizing	suspenders	28:11	21:1,6,14,23 22:8
96:17,24	12:23 26:5	terms	24:12 25:1 26:20
substantial	system	54:2 81:14 99:3 103:5	27:17 28:2,4,7,12
12:3	39:8 44:19 45:15 50:2	106:13 111:2	29:1 31:11 33:16,18
suburban	51:23,23	terrific	33:19 34:19 35:20
104:10	systems	92:23 117:12	37:15,23 38:4 39:3,4
sufficient	45:13 83:11 85:4	territoriality	39:12 40:4,7 44:18
70:3		104:1	46:13,14 47:21 49:15
suggest	T	territory	50:1,8,13,14,16
11:8 32:22	take	104:2	51:11,22 52:21 53:1
suggested	9:9 21:16 26:20 35:15	testimony	54:7 55:21 57:7,12
20:9 54:7 74:11	38:22 40:14 47:13	9:10 105:3	58:11 59:11,13 61:3
suggesting	51:13 62:4,6 75:10	Thank	61:12,22 62:12 63:17
11:7 19:20 103:7	80:10,18 89:9 91:3	5:3 6:8 29:22 36:2,3	63:24 64:24 65:16,20
suggestion	93:18 100:11	46:23 53:21 58:17	66:6 67:4,7,24 71:13
5:5 20:20	taken	117:14	72:12,14,16 73:14
Suite	30:11 117:9 118:4,7	Thanks	74:4,11,19,24 75:4
1:16	talk	95:19	75:22 76:18 77:22
suited	85:9 87:10 92:5	theoretically	78:8 79:16 83:7
56:21	107:11 114:18	33:3	84:11,23 85:3 87:1,6
summarized	talked	theory	87:12,13 90:20,21,23
99:21 111:18	7:1,2 38:1 66:16	77:4	90:24 91:3,7,18 95:4
supplement	100:24	they'd	98:13 99:5,16,22
10:4 92:18	talking	66:11 74:15 89:5	100:3,15 101:4,17
support	8:20 9:13 10:7,17	113:1	103:7,10 104:8 105:5
51:4	50:24 61:12 67:24	thing	105:6,8,17 107:4,18
sure	82:3 104:13,14	8:20 10:12 29:12	109:6 110:8,12 111:7
12:7 22:10 29:2 30:17	111:12	31:17 35:22 50:22	113:19,23 114:21,22
31:5 32:4 46:1 48:5	talks	69:21 76:14 77:14	115:9,13 116:20
48:7 59:18,20,23,24	57:4	90:13 99:18 100:19	117:12
73:4 74:2,9 86:15	taxes	103:21 107:10 113:8	thinking
90:7 95:15 100:21	61:18	116:6	41:18 63:24 79:24
103:6 110:7	tear	things	103:3,8
surfaces	9:24	6:5,15,22 7:19 8:7	third
10:16 11:12	technical	10:5,19 22:4 27:5	44:20
surprised	12:14 102:16	34:9 43:11 44:19	thirty
81:5	tell	48:5 59:12 67:16	78:5,7,10
survival	61:9 69:20 106:16	75:20,20 84:24 98:19	thorn
20:13	temporaries	99:20 101:23 105:5	77:5
survive	88:7	113:1 117:1	thought
18:3,24 20:2	ten	think	17:14 35:6 41:2 68:15

70:6 75:5 84:3 89:10	told	treading	two-year
94:22 102:13 104:22	66:17 68:19 94:12	67:5	72:22 73:16
116:9	tonight	trees	type
thoughts	3:7 4:24 6:11,16 10:9	21:4	28:5,5 30:17,21,22
14:22 85:7	100:5 114:7,17	tremendous	60:23 61:15
	· ·	114:2	
three	tonight's 7:21		<b>types</b> 61:20 89:13
11:2 16:23,24 17:8,12		tremendously	
18:5,9,11,15,17 19:4	top	36:23	typical
19:11,12 43:11 44:19	12:20	tricky	71:1
65:20 76:6,9,12 78:9	topic	90:9	typically
three-foot	107:11	triple	104:20
17:3,14 18:24	topics	41:19	U
thrilled	105:16	trouble	
114:8	totally	66:18	Uh-huh
throw	56:18 97:2	troubled	23:13 63:5
10:1	touch	33:21 66:8	ultimate
throwing	84:24 105:23	trucks	18:2
77:23 78:2	touched	68:7,8 75:21	ultimately
thrown	99:14 104:4 106:22	true	102:15 105:13 113:23
64:20	town	48:5,10 63:15 72:14	understand
tight	1:10 17:8,24 19:2 29:4	118:6,12	5:11 7:15 10:7 18:7
39:20 65:16 67:8 73:1	34:9,10,15 52:20,20	truly	20:21 33:15,22 36:19
73:13 75:5 77:2,6	52:21,22 56:20,24	12:8	37:2 43:14,23 55:19
tightened	57:5,16 58:2 82:17	try	56:6 62:17 65:7 66:9
116:24	84:4 85:14 86:21	5:14 67:20 76:4,9,15	67:23 89:15 105:14
tighter	92:19 93:17 95:12,16	77:2	111:10 115:22 116:2
94:2,3	100:24	trying	understanding
time	townhomes	5:22 11:8 19:24 23:5	3:18 17:22 64:23
6:11,13 9:20 18:3	69:12	28:5 36:19 59:12	70:23
41:19 44:8,15,17,24	town's	67:17,22 74:7 76:20	understands
49:15 54:1 64:14	22:9 82:9	89:14 104:6 105:15	36:7
			understood
65:1,12 66:12 69:18	track	turning	4:21 5:24 6:8 34:8
69:24 70:2 71:23	15:4	54:2	70:22 89:10 111:7
72:15,22 73:1,2	tracks	twelve	unfinanceable
74:18 75:21 77:2,18	12:21	65:11	66:7
81:6 89:4 94:11,12	traffic	two	
99:17 100:11 115:23	25:8 105:1,13 106:9	10:14 23:3 38:20	unhappy
116:18 118:5	transcript	61:20 62:22 64:13,17	10:5
times	64:19 106:20 118:6	64:18,21 65:9,18,22	unit
26:7 75:20 76:23 90:5	transcripts	67:7,16 68:21 69:9	88:8,11 109:20,24
103:24	71:6	69:11 70:8,13 72:24	units
today	transportation	73:7 76:5,9 78:4,8	11:12 73:9
11:1 112:11,17 113:17	26:9 30:1 32:3 55:12	84:2 89:12 92:7,8	unreasonable
today's	55:14,16 57:19 79:15	97:3 114:10,21	77:6,9
113:10	83:20 85:5 105:12	115:21 116:10	unusual
	ı	ı	I

		1	1
70:24	voiced	wanting	21:12 23:5 24:3 25:7
upheld	105:22	72:4,5,8	28:3,4 29:1,11 30:4
98:3 99:1	Volume	wants	35:22 36:5,5,20 38:3
urban	1:1	29:4 53:17	40:5 45:11 46:19
104:10,11	volunteer	Washington	49:20 62:18 63:18
urgency	117:10	1:11	64:7 66:14 74:9 75:1
75:17		wasn't	77:17,23,24 78:1,2,2
use	W	33:21 37:20 70:14	78:4 79:7,9 85:16,18
14:5 41:20 48:18 73:6	wait	71:3 83:5 93:2	85:19 90:6 95:20
102:18	4:10 58:8,14,19 62:23	watch	100:6 106:1,1 110:8
Usually	64:8 86:8 94:13	95:2,17	111:11,13 114:1,2
38:7	99:16	water	116:20
utilities	waiver	47:23 48:1 49:18,23	we've
90:2 91:16	108:20 109:3,4	50:5 51:4 52:3 83:10	4:1 5:2,2 7:1 8:2 9:4
	waivers	85:3 90:3 91:10	9:12 26:6 35:16
V	86:17,18 99:13 107:12	way	37:12,14 38:1 56:15
valid	107:19 108:1,19	9:24 10:3 19:4 21:2	58:6,12,14,19 64:5
104:8	110:10,14,16,21	27:18 31:15 38:4	64:10 74:19 78:14
variance	wall	41:14 54:13 68:2	84:2 99:23 100:15
101:22,23	11:23 12:17	73:11 100:20 102:7	102:13 103:5,13
various	want	112:4	105:11 112:21 114:8
22:4 37:5 69:8	6:6,15,17 7:23 8:15	Wednesday	width
vehicles	9:3 11:9,16,23 12:7,8	115:10,12,20,24	25:10
39:18 40:17	19:12 27:3,9,17,17	116:16	wiggle
Vehicular	27:22 30:14,17 31:9	weekend	65:3
25:8	33:1,9 34:19,20 35:5	112:15,22	wiggle-room
verbiage	36:16,17 41:6,21	weekly	76:7
62:5	42:7 44:9,24 45:6,20	57:14	wisdom
version	47:6 48:4,17,17,19	weigh	11:23
4:16,20 5:7 107:22,24	50:17 51:13 53:10	106:11	wonder
112:10,13,16 113:3,7	54:5 55:19 56:4,6	welcome	68:8
versus	63:12 65:4 67:14,20	53:22	wondering
72:8 85:7	71:17,18,20 72:17	went	68:4 101:2
vested	73:15 74:7,8 76:13	99:8 103:12	word
102:11	76:19 77:1,10,13	western	19:13 34:3,4 35:15
VFW	79:3 81:8 85:6,21	73:10	40:15 41:18,20 49:7
11:16 73:10	87:17 88:10,11,16,17	we'll	50:7 78:18 80:16
viability	88:19 89:9,16,20,21	4:8 6:7 10:9 12:9	90:9 102:18
19:9	90:3,6 95:5,15 99:3	76:12 77:19 85:14	worded
view	103:3,8,11 104:17,20	89:1 112:3 114:3	35:16 38:14 98:6,15
10:24 68:23	105:11 106:8 107:9	117:6	words
viewed	111:2 116:23 117:5	we're	13:3 19:5 28:15 31:10
37:17 69:16	wanted	4:2 6:4 9:15 10:15	92:15 94:9 102:23
violation	42:13 71:7 87:13	11:3,5 12:7 15:13	105:3
14:7 65:22	107:11 110:7	17:20 18:4 20:22	work

5:5 18:8 32:10 39:2	34:24 36:2 38:4 39:4	5:21	19
39:20,21 40:13 45:6	39:5 41:12,15 48:19	1/28	25:7,10,16 32:13
45:22 53:18 61:2	51:8 52:21 59:11,16	4:16 5:6,7	
67:10 73:11 75:13,17	61:20 62:6,9,17	1/5	2
84:12 90:21 92:7	63:19 71:13 78:12	4:21	2
103:2 115:23	79:24 80:5 81:17	10	66:1,4 69:3 89:3
workable	83:7 84:2 85:2,22	11:17 111:1	2nd
65:6 113:22,24	87:3 98:17 104:22	10:00	100:7,12 114:11
worked	106:7 109:9 110:5	115:2,7,9	117:14
101:5	114:13	10:01	20
workforce	year	117:15	11:23 32:17 35:21
67:11	75:9 78:21 100:20	100	20-foot
working	102:10 117:9	90:18	109:17
4:23 5:1 13:18 75:23	years	11	2010
80:19 81:21	64:13,17,19,22 65:9	69:15,18 111:1	3:16
Works	65:18,22 67:7 68:21	12	20130094
90:10	69:10,11 70:8,13	47:2 66:12 67:4 68:5	1:6
wouldn't	72:24 76:5,7,9,13	70:4	2015
10:23 13:5 31:11	78:5,8	12th	1:9 108:1 118:13
45:10 56:3 94:15	Yup	3:6,9 4:6,18 35:20	2017
113:7	25:4 53:24 59:6 87:5	110:16	118:16
wrap	95:14 100:13 117:8	13	23
115:9		3:14 13:16 109:5	25:15
write	$\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}}$	13th	23rd
10:1 44:1 53:16 103:4	ZBA	116:13	116:7,8
writing	106:1	14	24
20:2 37:13 44:5 90:12	zoning	4:4 5:16 6:9 10:13,14	35:21 70:7 71:22
90:17	1:5 22:9	13:8,17 14:19 110:2	74:10 86:16
written	Zuroff	15	24-month
49:3 54:16 66:15	110:6	6:18 13:12 14:18,23	73:23 <b>25</b>
82:11 92:2 101:10	0	15:7 23:12,16,16,20	
117:2	02111	23:21	3:16 36:5,5,9 <b>25th</b>
wrong	1:17	15th	3:22
105:19	02445	82:21	26
X	1:12	16.6.20.20	40:21 41:6 42:6
$\frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{X}}$		16:6 20:20	27
105:14	1	<b>16th</b> 116:12	42:5
XXIII	1		27.8
1:1	5:16 13:9 47:2 65:23	17 20:18,20	94:22
	66:4 69:3,14,14,15	179	28
Y	69:16,17 86:18 88:23	1:16	1:9 42:15,17
yeah	88:24 89:1,2 101:23	18	28th
11:6,10 13:1 14:17,24	1-118	16:19 21:9,19 23:12	3:20,23 108:2 113:14
15:23 16:1 17:1	1:2	25:3	113:16
24:18 25:1 30:8	1/12	23.3	
	I	I	l

<b>T</b>			
29	43	14:20	1:9 117:14
		57	7:09
42:22,23	64:5,6,10 <b>44</b>		3:2
3		93:20	
3	64:6,10	58	70
66:3 69:4 89:3 118:16	45	93:22	36:20 95:21 96:3,4
	64:7,9,13	59	99:11
30	46	93:24	8
47:12,14,18 49:5	79:9,11,16	6	·
31	46(e)		8.26
49:9	80:1	6th	82:9,16
32	47	1:11	9
49:9	80:15 81:1 82:2	6-12	9
33	48	23:8	
49:11	83:1,5 85:8	6.046B	108:1
333	49	23:4	9th
1:11	85:16	60	108:6 110:21 118:13
34		93:24	
49:20,21	5	61	
35	5	93:24	
52:17	88:23	617	
36	5th	1:18,18	
53:23 54:1	3:13 112:10	62	
37	50	93:24 94:4	
54:11,21 55:3,4	74:15 85:23 86:2,3,4	63	
38	50/50	94:18	
55:2	75:15	64	
39	51	94:20,21	
55:5,6,18 57:3	84:2 86:2,5 87:1	65	
33.3,0,16 37.3	52	9:21 58:12 94:21	
4	86:23 87:2	9.21 38.12 94.21 66	
4th	53	9:15	
114:12			
40	87:4,5,12	67	
55:7 57:10,12,13 85:3	54	95:1	
85:7	93:4	67.04.6B	
	542-0039	23:9	
<b>40A</b>	1:18	69	
9:8 101:10	542-2119	58:13 62:23 95:23	
40B	1:18		
1:7 106:1	55	7	
401	92:24 93:7	7-6	
1:16	56	23:10	
41	93:12,18	7.04.1	
36:4,5 58:7,7,16,18,20	5605	23:10	
62:18 63:4,11	14:21	7.041	
42	560611	23:4	
63:2,2,10,22,23 64:2,4		7:00	
	I	l	I